

# THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

APRIL, 1904.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### ANALOGY PROVES DESIGN IN NATURE.

By Professor JACOB COOPER, D.C.L., LL.D.

Two assumptions are necessary in judging of any work. One is that there must have been some person to do it and that he had a purpose to be effected. Without these postulates nothing, so far as we know, has ever been done. In the discovery of new knowledge we can proceed in only one way, which is by interpreting the unknown by what has already been discovered and incorporated in human knowledge. The process begins by reference to our own conscious action. We are aware of a person, the ego, as the instrument which acts and directs the action of thought. It is I, myself, that thinks and embodies the thought in a proposed product. Descartes rests upon this unshaken foundation as the starting point for knowledge and its application for some work. There is a person who is the author, who employs the means for work and thereby effects it. He is also conscious that he has a purpose which discloses itself more or less accurately in a plan or scheme of action whereby means are adapted to ends, and which result in success or failure according to his strength and skill in adaptation. This is the only method of procedure pursued in his own experience; and what he knows with reference to his own action he projects beyond that circle. First he applies it to the action of his fellow men because they are most like himself; and thereby their procedure can be most perfectly observed and known. He finds from observation of

their action and calling out their thoughts that they are guided by precisely the same principles in their work that he is himself. They may have diversities of procedure arising from differences in the personal equation, and which they employ to meet varieties in external conditions. Sometimes he cannot understand their plans of action, or the motives which inspire them. This may result either from inadequacy on his part to understand that which in itself is clear, or from intentional concealment on theirs. But his failure to grasp the causes at work does not in the least incline him to question the existence of such causes. He is quite as sure where he cannot understand their principles of action as where he can that they proceed *cæteris paribus* exactly as he does. For they are personalities which can think and carry out their thought in action. They are actuated by motives and endeavor to embody those motives in some definite result by purposely employing a plan to reach it. This may be faulty or imperfectly understood by the actors themselves. These may not be clear as to what they intend to do, or the means by which they propose to accomplish their designs. But they intend to do something, and they propose to do it in some way. So the contention which we maintain is proved as well in this case as where the actor is fully master of the situation; that is, knows exactly what he wishes to do and is in control of the means necessary for its accomplishment. Sometimes, nay often, we find ourselves in the same predicament. We desire to do something but our knowledge is not quite petrified into a distinct purpose. Or we may be clear as to what we are in quest of, but do not know the means by which it is to be reached. This is the condition of all discovery at its inception. There is a vague idea that a new hemisphere, corresponding to the one already known, lies beyond the misty and untraversed ocean. And though no Columbus has as yet made the discovery, we feel sure that if one is undertaken, it will have to be done by an agent who acts according to a plan; or by one who, in proposing to do something else, unwittingly employs the means necessary for this purpose. And so in all such discoveries as may be termed accidental, the two moments of our contention are equally effec-

tive. For there is an agent acting to effect a specific purpose, but though the limitation of knowledge fixes upon such means as will insure a different result from that of which he is in quest.

Yet the fact remains that we always proceed in our march from the known to the unknown, relying upon these presuppositions that we are agents, and act from a specific purpose. And what we are sure of in our own case, we project beyond the sphere of personal action. We find others like ourselves, and in quest of similar results. They appear to act as we do, and by the analogy drawn from our own procedure we conclude that they must act from the same principles. We thus project our own individuality into those objects nearest and most like to ourselves. The Ego thus becomes the standard for the measurement of the Universe *ὁ ἀνὴρ μέτρον ἐστίν*, as Protagoras has well said; and when understood in the sense in which he employed it, is incontestably true. It is evident, however, that this apothegm has been variously understood. But the most absurd of all is the view commonly held that the author meant to say that the mind of man made Nature to be actually what each one conceived it to be. This error has often reappeared, but perhaps never in a more deceptive form than in Kant's Categories of the Understanding. By these this great author appears to teach that these categories (or whatever ones be the true Expression of Knowledge) are moulds in which Nature must consent to place herself, to be shaped according to the plastic forms which the mind imposes. This explanation is suggestive of the moulds in which the tallow chandler runs his material to be in a form to give light; or the irons in which the cook runs her waffles to furnish bodily strength. But neither Protagoras nor Kant could be consciously guilty of such an absurd explanation of the process of acquiring knowledge. Undoubtedly the Greek meant to express the thought that to each mind the facts of external nature must be made known through the senses which furnish the raw material, and, the mind elaborating this into concepts, these two factors enrich us with such knowledge of the world as we are able to receive. This will vary in accuracy and reach accord-

YIM  
JUN 19 30  
JUN 19 30  
JUN 19 30

ing as our natural ability, sharpened by culture, is able to receive it. Understood in this sense, which was the undoubted conception of Protagoras, and we believe that of Kant—albeit his doctrine of Categories does have the appearance of a Procrustean bed on which Nature is to be stretched—there is no objection to anthropomorphism as an interpreter. The truths of nature are so many fixed facts: call them Forms of Knowledge, Categories, Ideas, they are realities; and as man gets the mastery over Science the moulds in his mind must correspond with the objectivity of truth. In the comprehension of these man must be a standard to himself by which he measures the facts of external nature and those of his own mental processes. But the measuring standard does not make the stick of timber to be of a certain length; nor does the scale—*scala intellectualis*—make the diamond of truth to be of so many karats weight. It merely tells what are the facts in relation to size and weight when expressed by units of some assumed standard. And here it is well to remember in proof that the standard does not make nature to be what this says. It only expresses as well as the mind can to itself and to others what nature is by a measuring line for which she must furnish the basis. Man formulates knowledge in this way, which is progressively accurate in concrete things, and absolutely so in those which depend on terms that are postulated. For in this case the definitions being assumed and the reasoning process infallible, the results are demonstrative.

But in concrete things which are known through experience and measured by material standards, we can only approximate the truth. For the senses are liable to deception, and cannot read the measurements with absolute accuracy even if a perfect standard could be discovered. Here, however, the human intellect can never reach perfection any more than in any other of its efforts. No perfect standard of measurement in space can be made. For even if the latest efforts were successful and the exact distance from the equator to the pole were determined at one time, the sphericity of the earth varying a little from the perfect circle is, moreover, never constant. And while the facts in nature are constant without shadow of



error, everything being *per se* exactly so large, yet in the most rigidly accurate of the physical and experimental sciences we cannot reach this accuracy, and express it in its own terms. But the process remains ever the same. We strive to know what is beyond present attainments or known localities by pursuing the methods which originated with ourselves, and are projected beyond as the processes which others must pursue. For if we did not act by this method we could not act at all. The only standard which we can know by experience is that which we have pursued; and judging others' methods by the same rule, and finding their results to agree substantially with our own, the conclusions are verified knowledge. This is evermore the mode of procedure, and as we discover that in each successive step we have had to use the same method, we are assured that in this way alone we are able to push the boundary of knowledge further continually.

In our investigations we often meet with phenomena for which we can give no explanation. In many cases the results of the most careful experiments when we have had a definite purpose and employed means with which we were well acquainted have been disappointing. For our efforts are either futile so far as the special quest, and if any results commensurate with our expenditure of thought and labor were achieved, this was unexpected. For we had endeavored to effect something else. Yet a result for which we were not prepared, and for which we could give no explanation, confronts us. This has occurred either accidentally or from principles not yet understood. But chance is found to be simply the measure of our ignorance. It may take a long while to reach this important truth. When the amount of accurate knowledge was meagre, and the causes of phenomena but little understood, the government of the world appeared capricious. For events did not seem to follow as we wished them and we made our ignorance the measure of nature. Yet from the start we knew the two fundamental facts indispensable in all true investigation: that every act done must be by a personal actor and the result of a definite purpose. We found this to be invariable with respect to our actions. We measured other people's

action by the same standard, and found the measurement to hold good as far as we could look into their mental activities. The fact that they sometimes purposely deceived us did not shake our confidence in the principles on which we proceed. Even here we could measure others' conduct by our own. For we, too, were conscious that we tried sometimes to deceive. Granting this yet in what might seem to be an objection to the principle we found a confirmation. For had we not tried to deceive? Nevertheless, even here we but confirm the principle. Proceeding by this method we judge other men's actions, and so advance to the world with which we are in touch. We get acquainted with the most obvious facts within the territory nearest to us. We enlarge that territory as far as our ability permits, and find the same laws to hold good; and therefore are justified in the assumption that they do not cease when our investigation is compelled to stop any more than that the road stops when we pitch our tent for the night. By the application of these facts we extend the sphere of knowledge, and at the same time by the combination find the truth mutually corroborative, so that they can be reduced to fixed systems. This view proceeds on the assumption that Nature is constant in her action; that there is uniformity running through her work, and we gain control over her operations by putting ourselves *en rapport* with her methods. But we can understand these methods only by the analogy of our own actions. If there be no agent active there will be nothing done. For we have never known either ourselves or any other agent like us, to act without a personality to direct and a plan through which the movement shall work. Our bodies do not act automatically, except through some derangement which robs them of their governing personality. And hence when we act without a purpose this is either through bodily or mental derangement, and we place such action outside of our proper life. It is abnormal, not subject to the usual laws of conduct, and therefore no standard for judgment. Hence we say such conduct is evidence of disordered intellect, and is so treated by the friends who have charge at home, or the State which controls in public life.

There is a clear distinction which should always be kept in view between a uniform course of action which is expressed under the form of a law or rule of conduct, and the agent which ordains and executes it. In the case of a person it expresses the standard and method of his action. As character becomes fixed in the course of time by discipline—first of parents and teachers and next by public authority—we can classify it as good or bad, rational or irrational. There is a principle running through it which is called the law of conduct, or the expression of uniformity in the character. But this law does not make itself. It is the expression of the mode of action habitual to a person. Neither does it execute itself; whether in the case of the individual, the family, or the State. It is merely the expression of the rule by which an intelligent and free agent shapes his course in life. The language is explicit. The agent shapes his own course. He acts according to the norm of his life, and does this of a set purpose and with freedom of choice. Clearly, however, the conduct does not make itself, neither does the law execute itself. As in the primary acts of consciousness there is an actor who purposes the deed, this also when repeated often becomes uniform, and can be summarized as the law of action in the given cases. But it would be absurd to say that the law of uniform action was itself both the originator and the executor. Surely in the first instance before the action had been petrified into uniformity so as to be called a law, it could not be said that the action performed itself without any other actor. For whence could it arise, and to what could it refer without some agent to conceive and execute it? And certainly the repetition, so as by frequency to show uniformity, would not dispense with an agent if in the first instance it could not be done without such agent. Hence the repetition of acts so that they petrify into uniformity, and are said to be laws of action, do not dispense with, or supersede, their original author. The repetition surely cannot supersede the necessity of an agent, which in the first instance was clearly required in order that there might be any act. So when this extended to the conduct of individuals, who by being united in a social compact are under the necessity of hav-

ing rules of conduct to which all must conform, there is still required some executive to carry out the political ordinances. This being a condition of social life whether in the family as patriarchal, or the wider combination in the State, the case is identical. The uniformity of requirement, to which all must submit as a condition of life in common, is embodied in a law which expresses the will of the community. It must be enforced by the authority which is lodged primarily in the entire people, and by them delegated to their representative; or has been won by an autocrat through superior power or intelligence. This law, however, is merely the expression of the united will of the people, or of him who governs according to his own pleasure. Whatever restraint the people place themselves under for mutual protection, or autocratic rule to which they have been made subject, we see that the law is one thing, and the agent who executes it entirely different. In neither case can the law make or execute itself. There is still an agent just as in the case of the individual Ego in his first act. The agent acts according to the law in a regulated community. This law has been enacted by an agent, it is enforced or applied by an agent, it would have no existence, there would be no place for action without both a lawgiver to devise a plan of government founded upon uniformities of action and requirement, and subjects to which this law can be applied. We must observe that the law is not *immanent* even in the case of the individual agent. It does not reside in the material of his nature. He is conscious of an agent separate from the material of which his body is composed. This agent acts by a distinct determination upon something; and this action by being repeated becomes a uniformity which he can observe either in his own case or that of others; and this becomes the rule according to which he the agent resolves to live.

There is much looseness of language in regard to the Laws of Nature. They are often personified and endowed with conscious, intelligent action. They usurp the place and dispense with the necessity—in the estimation of the naturalist or agnostic—of any Personality. For they are not only the rule of conduct, but the ruler that enforces it—than which nothing can

be more absurd when reduced to its proper signification as shown in our modes of thought and action. Law is simply an abstraction, having no existence without a lawgiver who established it, and a personal agent who executes it. This is undeniable when looked at in its origin and in the only place where it is possible for us to be absolutely sure of its application. Knowing this to be the case in our own instance, and projecting it into the conduct of others where we find that it holds good as far as we are able to determine, we consider it the universal principle of procedure wherever there is law to be ordained or enforced.

That we act from design when in our senses and free from restraint is as certain as any axiom or first truth. Hence we may say: If this is not true, nothing can be accepted as established in human thought and action. Are we then justified in projecting this principle to an indefinite extent? A more pertinent inquiry would be, in case its universal application were denied—where does the principle cease to be operative? For that it is operative with us to such degree that for any one not to act from design stamps him as *non compos*, either through lack of native intelligence or the loss of his reason by insanity. That there is design somewhere in the universe, and that this seems to be found everywhere that we are capable of examining, will not be denied. But how does this act? Where does it reside? Is it Immanent or Transcendent, Personal or Impersonal?—are all questions which have been discussed with earnestness, and should be decisively answered.

#### HOW DOES DESIGN MANIFEST ITSELF IN NATURE?

To this first question: How does this Design, which unmistakably exists in Nature, manifest itself? Is it Personal or Impersonal? To this question the earlier part of this question gives the only answer of which we are capable. For the only Design of which we have any conception must have its model in ourselves. We have no knowledge from individual experience or through that of others of an Impersonal Design. In truth the term itself is a misnomer, and conveys no rational conception to us. For as there cannot be an act done, or a

thought conceived in our experience without an actor, even so there can be no law ordained without a lawgiver, and no design formed or executed without some person possessed of intelligence who is the author. Design, purpose, striving after an end, all involve a being capable of thought. Or if the expression is preferred: Matter endowed with all the qualities requisite to constitute intelligence, purpose and will. That there must be this property somewhere in the universe which causes it to fulfil all the requisites of a conscious personality, is as certain as any fact of original consciousness in our own case, or of experience in the actions of others. Being aware that we act from the principle and therefore know its existence, we are irresistibly led to believe that wherever design is displayed in Nature it is effected in the same way as in our own individual industry. And if this be denied it must be on the principle of arguing from our ignorance to disprove what we know from our consciousness to be true. Yet as there is a strong and perhaps growing tendency to believe in what is termed Immanent Finality, it may be proper to consider the claims which this has to acceptance in the scientific world.

WHAT DO WE MEAN BY THE EXPRESSION IMMANENT FINALITY ?

These words may be understood in two senses. Immanent as opposed to Transcendent implies that the quality is inherent in the nature of the object where it is found, and is such a constituent of that object that the two are monistic to the extent that, of necessity, the one involves the other. Thus Immanent Design is a part of the constitution of the matter itself, and therefore the one cannot exist without the other. In this view Design is quite as necessary to matter as space-occupancy or temporal existence. According to this theory the matter develops or changes itself into forms which are adapted, one to the other, with reference to a function which they are to exercise in common both upon themselves and on any other object. The conception of Immanency excludes from its subject everything that is not consistent with itself; and, of course, rejects personality. Now the matter of the universe being capable of infinite division and integration, while personality is indivisible

without destruction, this supposed Immanency of Design has no analogy with any action involving consciousness, and therefore unlike any action which we can conceive. For a Personality is one, and consists of an organism for independent, conscious action. But as matter is divisible to any extent, and in its ultimate state has neither organ nor function, while Personality is absolutely indivisible and requires organs to exercise functions, it follows that if Design is immanent it is after a fashion of which it is impossible for us to have any knowledge from experience, or conception from *a priori* powers. Thus all analogy derived from the known when applied to the unknown offers no proof for such a principle; and contradicts it when we project our modes of thought to the economy of the world.

But there is another conception of Immanence which does not perceptibly differ from Transcendency. For one thing may be present with another, and yet not identified with it in nature or purpose. Here let us notice a distinction. Certain properties are inseparable from all matter. It is impenetrable, space-occupying, and has attraction. Each of these is immanent because we cannot conceive of these as separate from matter. If they were it would lose some of its inseparable properties, and with these its proper constitution. But a property may reside in an object without being a necessary constituent. Electricity, magnetism, heat, are in a body, immanent while there, and acting through the material to effect a given work. The body is the same in all phenomenal properties with or without them. You can think them all away without in the least derogating from the completeness of the object. The telephone, telegraph, or magnetic conductor is the same as to its constituents whether these powers are present or not. Life is immanent in the vegetable or animal structure; that is to say there is no phenomenal difference between the same portions of organized matter whether alive or dead. While united for the functions of life the spirit is not immanent, since it can be driven away by death, can be called to its dwelling place at birth. So while present with the organ it is really transcendent. For it can be thought of as separate, can make its own organ an object of thought; and can be separated in reality from this as it was



before the constituents were integrated into a body and as it will be after they are dissolved and there is no longer an organ through which to act. It is therefore indifferent whether we call a property immanent in this sense or transcendent; the idea is substantially the same. As remaining in the body and as constituting only one personality, the vital force is immanent. But as acting on the body *ab intra*, controlling and directing it, the vital force or soul is transcendent. The essential difference consists in this fact: The immanent quality, in the proper sense of immanency, is one with the organ; and there is no difference between force and organ. In the other the force is distinct; has been generated apart; controls it as an instrument or organ. And though they may be equivalent in some stage of their existence so that one may be expressed in the terms of the other as though they were in reality the same—yet the power to think and act, no matter how closely identified with each other; still the one thinks for the other; commands it and uses it exclusively as the instrument of its action. The more completely developed is the organ through which the power is employed, the more readily can we discern the difference between them. In the more perfect development as found in the higher orders of sentient beings the more distinct becomes the energy from the instrument which wields it. This is complete in the power of conscious action as found in man. For there he knows his body simply as the machine or tool through which the Ego, the man himself, effects his purpose. The two act together so completely that they constitute one personality, but this in two distinct organisms. Still, whether conscious of this distinction or not; whether the force be immanent and therefore inseparable from the material through which it acts, still there is design or purpose unmistakably there, which through it becomes more conspicuous in proportion to the integration and development of the organism, but was present in the first stage. Unless it was potentially there from the start it could never get there on the theory of Immanency. For this, if consistent, must admit that all which subsequently shows itself in development was there at the beginning. It should be observed



that just here the theory that material nature develops itself without the assistance of any transcendental power, is constantly guilty of either a parallogism or sophism. For by development new qualities are assumed to arise constantly. The additional quality arises through natural selection made by unconscious effort. From the most rudimentary form of matter, as incandescent gas, or star-dust, the material changes itself in successive stages; assuming constantly a greater degree of integration and adaptation of parts. But it is pertinent to inquire: From what source do these additions come? If there be a natural selection there must be an innate power of selection. For the change could not come unless there were some force adequate to produce it. And the slowness of the process makes no difference as to the power at work. The authors of the Development Theory, as a principle of working through Immanent Teleology, seem to think that if they have time enough they can do everything. Given, therefore, the countless æons, and primordial matter can change itself through every stage up to Plato or Shakespeare. But if the power in Plato when he wrote the Republic was not in the primordial matter, and was not put there either at first or subsequently by a transcendent personality, it would never have wrought its transformation and evolved itself into man. There would have been the paradox—not of some person or thing creating something out of nothing—but of nothing creating out of itself the highest product in the universe. There can be no statement more obviously true than that this is a fair enunciation of the absurd and impossible theory of Evolution. But the difficulty is carefully concealed in the theory of Development by Natural Selection; and the authors can see what they wish through the dim vista of time, even as a ghost-seer can conjure up any form his imagination prompts. But this doctrine of Darwin—which is substantially present in every system of pure naturalism from Democritus and Lucretius to Hæckel and Hartmann—surreptitiously assumes successive improvements, growths, stages of adaptation of the living creature. Or, to begin the process. At the proper stage the proper particles of gas gather themselves together from their fellow par-

ticles. Those which contained a superior form, weight, internal adaptation, or what not, shake themselves loose from their less favored gaseous brethren and the long course of evolution begins, which is to end in such an exalted creature as is able to give an account of his own generation. He not only knows how it was done, but was there, the man-child, named already *Pangenes* in propria persona, and begat himself. He laid the egg in chaos\* which hatched itself, fed itself with spoon victuals, wove the diaper linen, and swaddled its own nakedness. Such an evolutionist could teach even Aristophanes a lesson!

But, seriously: Unless there were in some of the particles of gas or star-dust a greater amount of rudimentary intelligence than in the other they would all develop into the same thing, and in the same period. In this case there would be no variety to select from; and, consequently, a monotonous universe consisting of units all on a par. For they, *ex confesso*, had all the same primordial elements, gas, or star-dust. They had the same time to work in; the same heredity, and the same environment. Both their external conditions and their internal propensities being the same, the development must needs be on the same dead level. For at first there were no varieties to select from, and none could arise without a diversity of constituents in the materials which were at work. So that the theory of Immanent Finality, and its coadjutor, Natural Selection, must have everything at the beginning which appears in the subsequent growth. For it is most clear that those particles of matter in whatever form the world originally existed, could hatch nothing, no matter how long the incubation lasted, which was not contained in the original germ. Hence Immanent Finality aided by Natural Selection cannot open up their shop and begin business without a complete outfit of forces and tools to manufacture them. Admit Immanent Finality which is involved in Natural Selection and Survival of the

\*Aristophanes' Birds, 694-5 Ἐρεβους δ' ἐν ἀπείροσι χόλοις τίκει πρώτεστον ὑπηνέριαν Νύξ ἢ μελανόπτερος ὦον. *Vid.* 690-703. Substitute "Darwin" for "Prodicus" and the Poet cracking his sides with laughter, speaks language suited to our own day.

Fittest, and you admit, *ex necessitate rei*, every element required in a Transcendental Creator. For there must be the energy and skill to effect a work or else it will never be done. No difference for our contention wherein or how it exists—it must exist in some place or mode, else its work will never be done. Hence, if it be said that by natural selection the material developed itself into all the advanced organisms, the only difference between this and a rational system is that this does without an intelligent agent working transcendently all that the latter can do; but in a way contrary to all our modes of thought, speech and action.

Natural Selection and Survival of the Fittest are terms which involve both Optimism and Design. But the effort of the Development Theory seems to get aid entirely of a personal Creator and Ruler of the Universe. Everything else is admitted *per force* except Personality. But this, so far as we know instinctively, or by a certain experience derived from our intercourse with others, is the prime requisite of all action. We never in the sphere of our own consciousness are aware of any two things being adapted for each other, or brought in contact so as to produce a definite result, except through the intervention of a conscious intelligence. The human mind can effect wonders by bringing its intelligence *en rapport* with those powers of nature which it has discovered. The instruments of modern art and skill are marvellous. They can transform the raw material into the finished product of the loom, the anvil and the printing press. Intelligence can transfer so much of itself into the crude material, can develop it so far that the designer can stand by and watch the product of his skill work almost automatically. He may look upon the completed machine performing without his intervention every conceivable act. For it is a characteristic of the advance in the application of science in the arts that the new realization follows close upon the new conception, which in its turn is quickened into existence by the increasing demands of an ever advancing culture.

Let us watch the progress in any one of the arts, as the manufacture of textile fabric. The first effect would be the

twisting of the bark of a tree, or the fibre of flax, hemp or cotton by the thumb and finger into a rude string. Then when several strings had been spun in this way they would be plaited together into a coarse web to be employed by *modistes* as a covering, or as a shield against the cold. In time the distaff would be invented to relieve the thumb and finger, and increase the speed of spinning. Next the wheel and spindle; then a large and a small wheel for the same purpose. But the processes are too slow to meet increasing demands. Therefore we must invent the cotton gin to prepare the material, the spinning jenny to change the fibre into threads, the loom to arrange these into the fabric wondrous in its uniformity and beauty. So we might follow the process farther until it ends in the garment, cut, fitted, sewed and ready to put on—and all done by machinery. The artisan may fold his hands and look with complacency on the result of his skill which has almost superseded the necessity of his interference. He may with Darwin and Lamarck say that all this skill, intelligence, design are immanent. If he had not put them into his work he might perhaps be justified in this conclusion. After the machine has been constructed and set in operation, let one of the lowest order of savages, found among the wilds of Borneo or Central Africa, be brought blindfolded and placed before such a perfect system of machinery; and if he be capable of comprehending its movements he will say they are automatic. And if he can be made to know what such terms mean he will say that it is Immanent Design, the development of the material without the intervention of a personal agent. Darwin, Hæckel and Lubbock are these savages. They consider a Creator of the Universe unnecessary because he has made a system so complete that it can act of its own motion, and needs no supervision. Like Whateley† jestingly said of his work on Logic: "He had made it so complete that others had been enabled by his suggestions to advance the science so far that he had superseded himself and rendered his work unnecessary." So Darwin and Hæckel *et id omne genus* find the universe constructed

† Whateley's Witticism.

so complete, and equipped with automatic laws that the Creator who formed the one and ordained the other is to be expelled from the house he has built. These savages stand before Nature evolving her web by Development, and in order to get rid of a personal Creator or Governor, they do violence to thought, language, and human action. They invent a jargon, or distort and reverse the meaning of words already in use, and declare that all is done by Natural Selection and Survival of the Fittest. Standing in the presence of a system so complicated that we can grasp but an infinitesimally small arc of the circle of the universe—complicated and exquisite, alike in the atom or a stellar system, so complete in its movements that, to use the language of "a prophet of their own:"\* "It will move on without collision forever"—they yet declare that the true explanation of this is *automatic action*. They cannot deny that there are coincidences of adaptation—for without adaptation what is the meaning of Natural Selection and Survival of the Fittest?—and therefore there must be Design somewhere to cause two things to be so fitted to each other that they must result in an improved condition. But they say that all this is found in the things themselves; that there is no evidence of Design working *ab extra*; and whatever is immanent is there as a constituent of matter, and therefore Impersonal. In the works of Human Industry it must needs be admitted that the machine was invented, patented, improved, set in motion by an agent working from without. This is a matter of consciousness in the case of our own work. If the powers we possess are innate, develop automatically, or with the help of heredity and environment, yet in whatever stage of advancement we find ourselves or others, we are assuredly conscious of a personality different from the instrument through which it works. For we resolve, and we move a limb or our body. We have a purpose and we embody that purpose in action elaborating it through complicated processes. And while we may justly marvel at the stupendous results of human intelligence directed by personality, yet the man himself is not only greater,

\* La Place.

but more real than his work. And so as we look upon the infinitude of Nature's powers and handicraft we are compelled to admit that there is a Personality, back of all, greater than all which this has done. And so we contend for an actor working by Design, who has left his model in our constitution by virtue of which we too can imitate his industry.

But however rude the inception or complete the finished result, the necessity of a personal actor, separate from the material through which it exhibits phenomenal action, is equally clear. This brings us to the very heart of our subject. We always advance in knowledge by starting from the known, and applying the principles thus far discovered for the elucidation of that which is beyond. Two assumptions must be made in order to render any advance in knowledge possible. One is that our mental processes are reliable, and that Nature is uniform in her action. If the first were not true we could gain no knowledge; and it would not be worth while for us to make any effort to attain it. And if the second were untrue then our processes, however veracious and reliable, could effect nothing on which we could rest secure. For it is obvious that the same process might be followed at one time by one result and at another by the very reverse. On these two foundation stones, however, we can erect the superstructure of knowledge. Our processes of thought are the work of a personal agent who applies them either to its own efforts for the development of self knowledge, or to external objects for a mastery over Nature. In either case, we, the self conscious actors, direct in the movement and make material objects tributary to our will. We project our personality beyond with the assurance that there is a land to be discovered, surveyed, mapped out and occupied. But we could not proceed in our voyage of discovery except by the assurance that the same sort of a world lay beyond us as that which we have already traversed. We are in the midst of a world which seems to be a part of a system. The same laws hold good, as far as we have been able to investigate, without any break or contradiction. The laws of matter, such as attraction, space-occupancy, transformation into its equivalents in energy, are found valid everywhere on the earth. Spec-

trum analysis discloses an identical argument as to the materials of the most distant body whose light can be analyzed so as to discover its constitution. The inner constitution of each diminutive portion, or the entirety as a system, is equally marvellous.\* Each molecule is the type of the whole; so that the one, paradoxical as it may seem, is as complete and admirable as the other. To adjust many moving bodies which have a common field of action so that they shall not interfere with each other is the greatest problem of mechanical skill. To give the same body different and apparently contradictory motions, and yet adjust each of these in a system so that their combined action is uniform, is beyond the skill of man to reach or express by the utmost resources of the calculus. Yet we have such a complication even in the solar system. Everybody in this numerous household of the sky has an untold number of motions to which it is subject. And when we reflect that our solar system is but one of a countless host, which all and severally have some influence on the other, we stand aghast at the intricacy of that system of sidereal motions which have been going on for countless thousands of ages. And if adaptation is necessary to the successful adjustment of two things to each other when the motions are few and simple, still more must this be true when the number of objects and the variety of motions increases. The difficulty becomes inconceivably great, and therefore requires a corresponding degree of intelligence, skill and power for the control. These qualities reside somewhere in the universe because their effect is evident. It matters not to our argument whether they be Immanent or Transcendent. But if the material universe is infinite, extending wherever there is space, then the Power which controls this work must reside in it, since it would be impossible for it to be outside of space. But it might be Transcendent in a proper signification of the word. For while locally present in every part, and therefore included in the sphere of the physical universe, it does not follow that it is one with it. Force can be present or absent from matter without changing its constitution. The machine may be ready for work but it does not move. There must be a new factor introduced before it will



act. But when introduced it is both immanent and transcendent. Immanent because it is present, and present in every part; transcendent, because it is different from the inert material it sets in motion. The electric conductor may be charged or empty. When charged it will act; when empty it will do nothing. The body may be dead and motionless. There is no speculation in the eye nor cunning in the hand. Shortly before there was a force present which rendered the organ capable of manifesting thought and action in such intensity as to control the world. There was something present before, which is not now in the machine; the body has lost all that previously gave it power for action. It is not proper to say that the force, the intelligence, is immanent when it can be present or absent. But in the case of the Universe the power which is now present has been there as long as the matter existed, and is inseparable from it. For both being infinite, each occupies an equal extent, and the one must be immanent in the other. This explanation is necessary to show that the Immanency of Intelligence and Force does not prevent their being different from the organ which wields them. And therefore it is fair to say that the Immanency of Design does not prevent its being different from the material though actually present with it. So this doctrine which seems to be the last resort of unbelief, in no wise prevents the presence of a personal Creator. For there is assuredly in matter or external to it—but in either case shaping and controlling it—both power and intelligence equal to all the effects which have been produced in the growth of all things. But these did not come from without the boundless space which includes the infinite universe. For this has not sprung up without a cause. It did not develop itself into a regular system by chance. For chance cannot adapt means to ends, cannot cause the survival of the fittest rather than that which is most unfit; cannot develop anything through selection since this requires adaptation through forethought. There must therefore be in the material universe energy and purpose sufficient to produce the results which the self-registering record exhibits in the world's experience. Whether this be immanent



or transcendent, so far as locality is concerned, is nugatory. For material being infinite in its extent, the force which operates upon it must be equally extended, so that this distinction may be omitted altogether in the discussion of our subject. As to the method of its action it may be one or the other equally well. The inventor puts a part of himself into the machine which he constructs. But he does not put all of his force, and he puts none of his personality. By the adaptation of means to method he can construct any number of machines and put them in action, even when he is apart from them all. He is assuredly a transcendent force as regards every article he makes. Even when he is the patentee and there is a great secret employed which no one but himself knows, he is apart from the machine which he devises and sets in motion. And though it be the case of Montgolfier and his balloon which his inventive genius has constructed, and though his own hands have done every part of the work, even to the manufacture of the gas by which it is elevated and he takes his seat as the only aerial voyager, though he be necessarily with his craft, and rise far above all external influences except such as are all pervading, he is as much transcendent as though he were on earth, and by touching a button started through a wire a machine ten thousand miles away. The personality cannot be immanent in any proper sense of the word. It cannot be imparted to another person or thing. It cannot be diminished, divided, impaired, annihilated; but remains in as complete integrity as ever, though it may have imparted motion or even life to any number of organs. For these, as in the case of children, naturally outlive his personality. The Parthenon remains though the master genius of Phidias and Ictinus who devised the plan, and the workmen who executed their orders, have disappeared. The spirit which conceived, and the hand that inscribed the Republic, are no more among the living; though Plato is as immanent in his work as when he composed it in his private study in the Academy. So Stradivarius is apart from his violin, which he alone could make; and while no other could do such work, he is, and was at the time of its construction, as

completely apart from his wondrous instrument as the child who extemporizes a fiddle from a cornstalk. Every instance which might be chosen would illustrate the fact that the author, the creator, the mover, is apart from his work. The one is active; the other passive. The one gives; the other receives. The one is a conscious personality; the other is plastic matter to be moulded as the potter pleases. As the potter is not the clay, no matter how exquisite the vase is shaped and decorated by the workman's genius, even so God is not identical with the work of His hands; or the thought which elaborates the Design in Creation, and ordains the laws for its government, is the universe which they control.

Thus Immanence, the last retreat of unbelief when worsted in its endeavor to expel the Creator from the house which He has builded, has been proved to be a refuge of lies. But even were Immanence accepted, it in no way excludes the necessity of Design in the development of the world, or of an Agent who puts that Design in execution. If there is Design manifest in the economy of Nature at the present time—and this no one will have the hardihood to deny—it could not come into the material creation at some subsequent stage of development, arising like the horns of a young bullock, when there was need of it. Here is the viciousness of the whole system of Development as taught by Darwin and Huxley. Design, Intelligence, Adaptation, Survival of the Fittest, are surreptitiously brought in just as they are wanted. But it is pertinent to ask: Whence are these derived? Have the Naturalists a great ocean of these precious qualities *on tap*, from which they can draw at pleasure? They conveniently foist these in just as they find it necessary to the completeness of their theory, but do not tell us whence they derive their aids. Like the Psalmist, of whom they have never heard, they "drink from the brook in the way, and renew their strength." Were their claims not so absurd we would not treat them with derision. But the fool must sometimes be answered according to his folly; must be met on his own grounds, and fought with his own weapons. He admits Design even though when most

loudly berating Teleology as contrary to the scientific method. He speaks of the Struggle for Existence, Survival of the Fittest, Adaptation of internal organ and function to external environment. He uses the same terms which the believer in Finality employs; and his argument demands the same use, because he is employing the same ideas and addressing the common consciousness of mankind. He may say these terms are used figuratively, and he has to employ them, else he could not express his ideas. This is giving up the contest. For if human language, as the embodiment of man's thought, is not suited to express their theories of the evolutionist, this is simply because those thoughts are not the product of reason. For if there is such a thing as truth for man he can understand it, and express it to others, in the common vehicle of thought. If he can do neither, then he is not in sympathy with Nature's methods. If his theory will not quadrate with the facts which constitute human knowledge, and are expressed by human speech, it is because the theorist is out of sympathy with the course of Nature as understood by common reason, and enunciated by ordinary speech.

It is clear that the attempt to construct and govern a world without Design directed by a Personal Agent is a failure. It attempts by appeal to a principle not found in our own experience or that of other men, or exhibited in the working of Nature, to destroy every method of action on which we must proceed if we either act or think; change the meaning of human speech which has become solidified in the experience of the world, and attempt an entirely new way of explanation for all the facts of science. We are conscious that we have a personality which is separate from the bodily organization, and from the work which itself does. We know that so long as we are in our senses we act from Design, which becomes such a second nature that even when bereft of our senses, there is still "method in our madness." We see others acting from apparently the same reasons as we do, and by projecting our methods of action and incorporating them with the efforts of our fellow men, we find that the results correspond with those which follow our exclusive action. This gives assurance by the effects,

that their thoughts and methods are substantially the same as ours. From this testimony of our own consciousness and that of those who, as we learn by interrogating, are acting from exactly the same motives and according to the same principles, we formulate our plans to investigate Nature. If there be a community between our thoughts and her economy, we can understand her movements and apply her forces. By doing so we discover facts and classify them into sciences. We find a plan or system which, if Nature be constituted according to our conception, proves that the same principles hold good everywhere. For we thus see there is an adaptation of means to ends; a combination of actions, diverse in time and place, which unite to produce an effect, and we conclude that this action is on the same principle as ours. So strong is this feeling that if we, as explorers of the undiscovered regions of science, invariably fail and lose ourselves, we do not think that Nature is at fault but that we have failed to come near to her heart and listen to her voice. We attribute to her absolute veracity because we have never detected a mistake in her plans, or in the means for their elaboration. She has a design which we have not yet penetrated, but which when properly sought for will be found; a part of a consistent plan devised by a wisdom as much above ours as the mechanism of the heavens is superior to our baby-house constructions. We cannot, without stultifying ourselves, try to believe that we can understand all the plan of the universe, or improve upon it in any of its parts. For we being a part of that nature, and with capacities for understanding her in some degree, must be inferior to the whole in wisdom as much as in power or extent.

Finally. We know that we are separate from our work. For however much of our thought and energy we have put into our construction, we have not transferred either the whole, or any part of our personality. So if we reason according to our own standard, and see evidences of wisdom and power in the universe, we will conclude that this is merely a work on the same plan as our own Industry; but on an infinitely larger scale it, too, has a Maker, who has proceeded on the same

methods. For if He did not work by the same methods our reason compels us, we would have no power to understand the workings of Nature, and no science would be possible. Hence if we can have any science of that which is beyond us, we can get possession of it only by using the methods which we must employ in our own works, in the belief that the part already disclosed to us is a section of the circle of infinite thought and being. Thus Analogy, which is our only guide in explaining that which has not yet been traced as it has been in the explanation of that already known, teaches us that what seems to be Design in Nature is true; that there are everywhere means adapted to produce ends—a fact which the materialist and agnostic unconsciously admits at every step of his argument to prove that there is no such thing as conscious adaptation. And as we know that in the sphere of our experience no force is wielded, no plan is devised or executed, except by a Personality; so we are estopped from believing that this was possible in elaborating the System of Nature which is infinite in extent and intricacy of construction. Hence we are necessarily shut up to the conclusion that there is a Transcendent Person, who is capable of creating, sustaining and governing; that this Person has come near to us in adapting his thoughts to our understanding, his works to our use, and his laws to insure our supreme felicity.\*

\*The editors deeply regret to have to say that since the reception of this able article, its eminent and scholarly author has been called away by death, from his position as Professor of Philosophy and Logic in Rutgers College.

## ARTICLE II.

## THE MISSION OF THE COLLEGE.

By Professor JOHN A. HIMES, LITT. D.

The lines of demarcation between the high school, or academy, the college and the professional school have recently become somewhat blurred. The high school, instead of confining itself to the limited number of subjects which its pupils are capable of mastering, has extended its curriculum so as to include various subjects once regarded as the province of the college. "Primers" of science, literature and criticism have usurped the time once given to arithmetic, English grammar and the elements of language to the manifest weakening of instruction in these branches. The "primers" have taken the edge off the interest in their respective subjects when an attempt is afterward made to pursue them in a manly way. Lamb's "Tales from Shakespeare" has proved a positive obstacle in the way of getting pupils to read the actual works of the dramatist. Not always, but too frequently, an elementary course in "civics" hinders rather than helps a more mature presentation of the great principles of government. In science a colleague, an experienced and successful teacher, tells me he has observed substantially the same thing in some of the branches in his charge.

On the other side the professional school is trenching upon the domain of the college. Subjects recognized as belonging strictly to law, medicine and divinity are elective with undergraduates and allowed to count toward a degree. It is urged in favor of this policy that one study is about as good as another for discipline, the significance of the degree is not lowered and time is saved. From a superior point of view, however, the innovation is most regrettable, for it crowds out something that is eminently worth having and the lack of which means a narrower and spiritually poorer man. Strange indeed that an age whose machinery enables one person to do the work

of ten should need to scant time for self-improvement! Both kinds of encroachment, that from below and that from above, come from unreasonable haste and impatience for material profit and both are unfriendly to high and solid intellectual attainment.

What, then, is the true function of the college? What should it do for the individual and society? And in fulfilment of its mission what should it offer to those capable of its high rewards?

A low view considers its training solely as a means of getting a better livelihood. That it serves for this is undoubtedly true, and such a reason may be urged upon a sordid parent in behalf of a bright and ambitious boy who would otherwise lose his birth-right. A calculation made some years ago convinced me that a collegiate education increases the average intelligent man's earning capacity at least threefold. But it would be a poor compliment to urge such a motive upon the readers of this REVIEW. Two friends, a student with scant means and an older man were once driving past a fine farm with exceptionally large and handsome buildings. After both had expressed their admiration the younger remarked that he would prefer his collegiate education to even the gift of the farm, if the alternative were offered. The older demurred, but the other has never had occasion to change his estimate, nor to regret that he turned away from the opportunity, prior to the last year of his course, of a higher salary than any he has ever since received. Even in this commercial age there are some who aspire to better things than those which can be measured by money.

If the selfish conception of what the college should make of a man is not to govern our estimate of its mission, what can be said for the unselfish, much urged in our foremost institutions, the idea of service to one's generation? Such a life principle is a high one, full of hope and promise to the country and to the church, especially when conjoined with democratic recognition of equality and aristocratic courtesy of manner. Its product is a Governor Taft, who responds to the petition of the islanders of the East and for their welfare exiles himself from



home in an unfriendly climate and puts aside a coveted office of the highest dignity. It exorcises the cowardly spirit of the hireling, calls in the steady energy of duty and makes the man think more solicitously of his work than of his wages, or even of recognition so dear to the ambitious. Instead of demanding all that is due and perhaps overestimating the indebtedness of the world to him, he stands ready to offer himself "withouten hyre" in some good cause. High authority has recently commended this spirit of service as the right and perhaps sufficient religion of an educated man. So amiable and worthy is it that one hesitates to criticise it as imperfect and therefore insufficient to be set forth as the ideal to which a system of education should conform. If only the youth of our colleges would adopt this instead of the narrow and selfish ideal as the goal of aspiration and effort the gain would be immense.

And yet the system of education such an ideal of life would require would not differ greatly, I think, from that demanded by the lower ideal. The call for the "practical" would still dominate and would exclude, or narrow, many subjects now admitted to the curriculum. What then is that ideal of life to be realized as far as possible through our system of education?

We are placed for seventy years in the midst of this world doubtless for the discipline it can give us. The soul is to be perfected in wisdom and goodness to the extent of its capacity. Much of this discipline can be acquired only through service; we can get a true knowledge and command of the world and ourselves only by handling and using and beautifying what presents itself to us. We get our best knowledge of men by serving them and coöperating with them for worthy ends. But if this is all, the time spent on astronomy is wasted; geology should be limited to such information as will enable us to find springs of water, wells of oil, and mines of gold, silver and iron—speculations as to the age and formation of the earth are profitless. Poetry—well, that may do for the amusement of an idle hour, but is utterly vain as a subject for serious study. Even theology, if any room is left for it, should be confined to rules for conduct; the contemplation of God as the infinite and



eternal should give way to what he requires of us in the duties of every day.

Let me here digress a moment to say that it is not the special business of the college to investigate and discover new truths for the world. That in the main should be left to the university with its trained specialists and to individuals here and there who have command of means and leisure. The business of the college is rather to interpret the facts brought to light by investigators to minds prepared to receive them and thus extend their power. The college faculties are, or should be, composed of men capable of understanding the world's progress and of communicating it to the young, popularizing and vitalizing it in the transmission.

Affirmatively, then, the function of the college is so to introduce young minds to the various departments of human learning that they may through their lives have access to the wisdom which the world holds.

To this it may be objected that such a scheme contemplates the attainment of universal scholarship, an attainment no longer possible since the extension of research in so many directions. Of course, minute knowledge is not intended; but only such an acquaintance with processes and results as will enable men to estimate their value and lead to the best issue in wisdom and goodness. Investigators are constantly coming upon fresh and large surprises in many directions; our information and interest ought to be broad enough to give us a comprehension of these new discoveries. Besides, the college course is only an introduction; the acquaintance is to be improved and enlarged upon through a life time; the ripened fruit is to be plucked only in the maturity of years. During the fleet quadrennium—and from this point of view how irrational seems the proposition for a reduction of time!—those subjects are to be presented which will open the largest and richest domains of knowledge. Through this period let the professional studies wait; their facts and methods will become stale enough in the professional school and the long practice of years. Unless we prepare ourselves in youth to advance with the whole progress of the world, pro-

fessional practice will become at last largely automatic, mental activity will cease and the dead line will be reached, just as surely though perhaps not so noticeably, in other pursuits as in the ministry.

The test for determining the right of any subject to a place in the curriculum is the inquiry: To how large and important a domain will it give access? I have never been able fully to accept the culture theory of collegiate education—the notion that it matters little or not at all whether we gain and hold any actual knowledge while we are getting an education, provided only we find mental power and growth. I do not see how the latter can exist apart from actual knowledge—information on a wide range of topics. Truth is too precious to be dealt with so cavalierly. Culture without intelligence sounds like a contradiction. The information imparted in a college course is usually choice and vital, illuminating our subsequent experience and ordering and systematizing the whole.

The Latin and Greek languages will admit us to almost the whole past of our modern civilization and are therefore to be preferred for the curriculum to the Sanskrit and Arabic. The standard of good literature, too, is to be found in the great writings of Greece and Rome. We did not comprehend just what we had when our boyish minds were captivated with the clean, melodious phrases of Virgil and Horace, but we knew that we had something vastly different from the common-place expression of daily life and newspaper English. While translating the battle scenes of Homer or the passionate speeches of the Greek tragedies we felt that we were standing at the sources of power and getting a criterion by which to judge the literatures of every age and language. The slow and sometimes painful process of translation fixed in our minds the strong and musical expressions so that if we had within us the sense to appreciate them we could not forget them.

But as time goes on an ever-enlarging proportion of the world's good literature is found in modern languages. They do not furnish the standard, perhaps they never will; but they are full of a new spirit, a sweet humanity, a pure religion;

they appeal to the gentler rather than the sterner emotions; they introduce us to a wider sympathy with the world we live in. They should be studied with the purpose of making them instruments of use in intercourse. Foremost of the modern languages are the German, the French, and the Italian, because of their superior literatures and still more because their nations lead in the history and scientific research of our own times. They demand part of the time formerly assigned to the ancient classics. But what can be spared? Perhaps some of the exhaustive grammatical drill of days past could give way and most of the literature be retained. The name "grammarian" has never been a title of high dignity; sometimes it has sunk to the level of "syllable-chaser" of the present day; both have designated those who give attention to the mechanics of speech to the exclusion of the substantial thought.

Though it has been my fortune nearly all my life to be connected with schools where the importance of English was emphasized I can see a danger of excess in this direction. Besides the traditional studies in general English only a few leading authors need to be studied and interpreted in the class-room. The object should be to enforce such vigorous attention as will reveal the best thought of the author under consideration both in his general plan and in his rhetorical expression. The problems are often complicated and difficult but the reward of the solution is adequate and inspiring. Not many writers, perhaps half a-dozen of the greatest, can be treated in this way with as much profit as would come from reading some ancient classic. If a student can acquire a satisfactory knowledge of these, it is largely a waste of time to delay him upon second or third rate writers. These may perhaps be advantageously considered in the mass, but the best way to become acquainted with secondary English authors is by private reading. When a way is once clearly opened a guide becomes an impertinence. What a man is likely to seek and read for himself the college does not need to teach; it ought to discover what is most worthy and least likely to be sought or understood and content itself with giving that.

The fundamental importance of mathematics combined with its inherent difficulty and general unattractiveness should call for much attention to it in a course of study. In early life the time-consuming problems can be made as interesting as puzzles, the solution of which brings a sense of triumph that can hardly be matched in any other intellectual pursuit. Advantage should be taken of this at least till the sense of number and magnitude and the distinction between necessary and contingent reasoning is perfectly clear. Something is seriously defective when college graduates—and there are such—will venture to dispute the general accuracy of astronomers in determining the size and distance of the heavenly bodies and will fail to see a difference between such conclusions and speculations as to the habitancy of the planets. Without mathematics one can scarcely pass the threshold of the sciences whether natural or social.

Little urgency is needed to day to win liberal room in the curriculum for scientific studies. The current of intellectual activity sets strongly in that direction. The complete mastery of chemistry, physics, biology, geology, or astronomy would require a large part of man's time for years, but the leading facts, tendencies and methods of all these sciences can be gained in college to such an extent that discoveries in them can be followed with interest in after life. An appreciation of at least popular treatises on such subjects will broaden a man's field of vision and lead him to juster and more liberal views in almost any department of thought. A man so saturated with theology as to reject the truth in these materialistic sciences will be less trustworthy even in theology. But the distrust of scientific facts and methods has already measurably disappeared and science and theology are no longer enemies. The astronomer by his revelation of the amplitude of the universe, the chemist and physicist by showing its structure, and the geologist by demonstrating its age have dignified theology by correcting some of the errors of its immaturity. This furnishes a single illustration of how discoveries in one department of knowledge may affect the conclusions of another—proving the importance of knowing many things in order to know anything well.

The problems of society and government and international affairs occupy so large a share of the best thought of the time that a scholar who would neglect them would be hopelessly out of relations with the age. The college should have enough of these subjects for a comprehension of their main aspects and for the attraction of men into social and political service, not necessarily of the office-holder but of the patriotic citizen. The minutiae of the social and political organization can best be learned through the subsequent activities of citizenship. The fundamentals of law and justice have high moral and educational value and should form part of the equipment of early manhood.

The climax of the course is in philosophy, ethics and religion. If any branches of knowledge should be taught wisely and well, surely they are these. If sincerity and conscience are needed anywhere, they are preëminently needed here. Lack of enthusiasm and earnestness can be excused in any other rather than in these subjects. Teaching and life must be conjoined here far more vitally than is necessary in other departments. Denominational zeal and ancient, outworn subjects of dispute should be banished for an earnest and honest consideration of the doubts and beliefs of to-day. This does not necessarily mean a lax faith or a departure from orthodoxy. It means a faith triumphant in reason, not the cry of a sect or an inheritance from tradition. There is such a thing as an orthodoxy which is above skepticism as well as an orthodoxy which is beneath it and therefore beneath the respect of educated men. Its spirit should be irenic rather than militant, deliberative rather than denunciatory, the enemy only of fanaticism, whether of formalism or of license. The distinctly religious exercises of the institution should receive most careful attention and be made so helpful as to attract at least the sober-minded. The best and ablest men should be sought for this work. Something more than scholarship is needed here—an infusion of divine helpfulness and sympathy with man and a powerful sense of the reality of the unseen and eternal.

Something has been said of the discipline the world can give

us in seventy years, with the intended implication that at the end of that period the every-day duties and experiences have become so much a part of our nature that further repetition would bring little benefit; the service of this sphere of existence has been performed, we are ready for an advance to another and larger sphere. The reality of that other and larger sphere must be practically accepted; the wretched and discouraging motto of "One world at a time," now displayed in some quarters, must yield to the belief that this life prepares for the larger existence. Such a consciousness ever abiding will not be a hindrance but a help and inspiration to the performance of our present duties.

I have now hinted rather than fully outlined my conception of what a college should do for its foster-children. The standard, though pretty high, is reasonable. But it must be admitted that some who are capable of large culture are nevertheless so deficient in certain directions that studies therein are altogether beyond them. For such the recent development of the elective system has advantages. This system, however, has in some places been run to such an extreme that the foremost educators have been lamenting the "disintegration of the curriculum" and the resulting chaos. When graduates and freshmen are actually listening to the same lecturer, no wonder that he is at a loss how to adapt himself to his auditors. The old and rigid separation into the four classes is far more conducive to sound scholarship, as is recognized in the increasing favor shown by the great universities to the smaller colleges where the elective system obtains in a much lower degree. Nor can I discover that this chaos has resulted from obedience to an imperative, popular demand. With few exceptions the people are ready to yield to the guidance of the great educators. The confusion seems to have originated within the great colleges themselves, inspired apparently by an unworthy rivalry in large promises that have far more show than substance. Doubtless the colleges graduate larger numbers than they would but for this wide election, but this by no means necessarily implies a gain to true scholarship in the country.

Bare mention can be made of physical culture which is so important a feature in the college life of to-day. The notion that the student of past generations was a pale, thin, bloodless youth destined to an early death—a perfect contrast to the robust, muscular fellow of the present—has no basis in fact. Youth has always had its activities and sports and has always been the splendid, vigorous thing it is now. But organized sport and exercise have their advantages. The spectacular intercollegiate games of the athletic field have given a new zest to college life. Their moral benefits, however, I am inclined to believe, are greater than their physical. On the other hand, the gymnasium drill can be spoken of with more unqualified approval. Instead of strength it aims at suppleness and grace, a most serviceable possession to the scholar and gentleman.

Colleges are scarcely as separate and select as formerly, but are urging their advantages upon many who would once have been excluded. The higher education has not progressed in proportion to the numbers enrolled in our universities and colleges. The requirements have fallen, in rigidity if not in quantity, both for entrance and for advancement, and names are found on the registers of many institutions which could hardly have got there by any test of scholarship. The tone of the academic life has been lowered; the atmosphere is less charged with intellectuality than in some periods of the past. The mission of the college is only to those who can receive its benefits by virtue of ability and attainment; the rest are as much intruders as the man at the marriage feast without a wedding garment.

We reaffirm our earlier proposition that the college exists to direct the young who have capacity and purpose towards getting the most out of life, not in any selfish way but by fulfilling to the utmost the Divine intention in giving life in a world like this. Wisdom and goodness—a delight in the truth put into the structure of the universe and a spiritual exaltation into good will to every creature manifested in constant, beneficent activity—are the aim of its instruction and discipline. It fails if it does not serve higher than material interests; it is failing in

part even now because of the prominence given to wealth and machinery as ends in themselves; but it will recover and assert its true dignity when the mad rush and noise of business begin to grow tiresome and time for deliberation and reflection is again demanded.

As a corollary from all this we infer that a man's connection with his college should not cease on the day of his graduation. Not in a trifling sense or for a merely sentimental and temporary purpose is a college called a foster-mother. There are differences in mothers, some being so narrow and peevish that the children are well rid of their influence, but a worthy Alma Mater will afford an intellectual home, a source of inspiration to the end of life. Frequent and close communication should be provided for on the one side and heartily responded to on the other. The college should be solicitous that its good instruction may show fruit, the graduate that he may bring no shame upon its good name, and both that the sense of gentlemanly honor therein may be high and every influence issuing therefrom may be stainless. Not for social purposes only do we urge frequent reunions in the classic shades, though no other social events can compare with these, but as an intellectual and moral reminder. Without this amid more sordid surroundings the inspiration will in many cases grow feeble, the life of the former student will sink back to a lower plane, his high resolutions will be forgotten and the stars he once saw will go out one by one from his firmament.



## ARTICLE III.

## SOME PRESENT NEEDS IN EDUCATIONAL WORK.

By Professor CHARLES G. HECKERT, D.D.

Possibly no man in our Church, certainly none of the clergymen, will question the advisability of confronting a grave problem fearlessly and intelligently. Whether we be optimistic or the opposite as to the ultimate outcome, makes little difference. We are all agreed that educational results among us are not just as we should like them to be, and further, we are fully persuaded that the needs are, if anything, more pressing at the present time than they have been at almost any other period in our career as a Church in this country.

The fathers no doubt had their struggles in establishing our colleges and schools of higher learning. As one reads the story of the sacrificing toil of the founders of Hartwick and Susquehanna, and of the Gettysburg institutions and Wittenberg, one has the thrill that comes always from contact with heroic souls. Those men worked as they prayed, and in time God gave them to see of the travail of their soul. Doubtless the temptation often came to them to lay down the work, feeling that it was greater than man could accomplish. But, after struggle, and in some instances bitter opposition, there were brought into being colleges and seminaries that have for more than a half century done well their part in the great development of the Lutheran Church.

We are now in the possession of the labors of the men who have preceded us, and some of us have been amazed to find that the world has moved, and the young people of the day are making demands that were never heard of before. The fact confronts us that old things have passed away and some of the faithful are greatly disturbed thereat. There is nothing remarkable about this mental disturbance, for it is likely the same in kind as that which once thought it a rather ungodly

performance to use stoves for heating purposes. An innovation is generally unwelcome, and why should not the educational opportunities of twenty years ago be ample? If public school methods have changed in the last generation so greatly that the evolution has been well nigh revolution, is that any reason why the colleges should not stand firmly by the conservatism of the past?

Let it be understood that the writer is neither disturbed nor even surprised that a change has come over our educational spirit. Possibly it is because he has been in touch with changing conditions, and largely in sympathy with them. Why should not the youth of this day have advantages superior to those enjoyed by his parents? If this is an age of science and of tremendous strides in the investigations of natural and physical phenomena, why should not our Lutheran young people be put in the way of pushing to the front ranks of those who are going to make the record of the twentieth century so glorious? Why not?

Having determined our point of view we are now prepared to look at some of the facts as they suggest themselves to those of us who are more directly interested in education. There are needs so imperative that simply to name them is to recognize them. There are others not so conspicuous and yet of such far-reaching importance that, if neglected, they may work great damage to a great cause.

Let it be premised that a church school need not of necessity be a rival of the state university. There are some lines of work that might with propriety be entrusted to the state. It may be doubted whether there is at present any demand that our colleges should teach agriculture and the technical and the manual arts. Why not frankly recognize the fact that the state may be able, in the very nature of things, to handle some lines of work to better advantage than the Church? This would clear the way for a better understanding of the general situation.

But now to the needs as they appeal to us, not simply in Ohio, but in all our institutions.

1. Probably one of the things absolutely necessary is for all our colleges to catch more of the modern spirit of education. By this it is not meant that we are all absolutely deficient in this particular. Such a statement would be both foolish and untrue. But is it not a fact that even in our use of the appliances at hand, we are not as a great denomination keeping pace with advancing ideals in our educational effort? Here in our own college we are awakening to the new standards and one hears of like results elsewhere. But in reality these efforts are spasmodic and uncertain rather than the happy issue of a carefully prepared plan.

Allow me to particularize. The time is now ripe for our schools to abandon the old ideas as to who are suitable men for the professors' chairs. In the former time our colleges looked for a minister, long tried and scholarly, and the results seemed to justify the method. This simply must be given up if we are to give our youth the advantages that they can receive at other institutions. We need the specialists in our church schools just as much as they do in the larger colleges. We must have the men who have added to their college courses the university career, and who by special preparation and often by travel have fitted themselves to teach. The time is coming soon when a man who has not thus equipped himself will stand no chance of being elected to any chair in any good school.

Here is a place then, where we can begin to fortify ourselves. No need to wait until the necessity is upon us. No need to delay until we again trail at the rear of the educational procession. If there be any truth in these things let our church authorities see to it that in the all-important matter of selecting men for college positions no man be chosen who is not thoroughly qualified in the manner indicated.

A fear may be entertained that the religious side of our student body may be neglected if this program is carried out. Let us think about that. There is no reason why the specialist need be less devoted to the cause of the Gospel than his friend the minister. Indeed I question if more religion cannot be imparted by the upright life of a pure-hearted instructor who may

never directly open his lips upon the deep things of our faith than in any other way. Keep in mind that this age despises cant above all things else. Religion is not so much a matter of talk as of life, and we are not afraid to trust the men who have learned reverently to know much of God and his ways.

There is another thing about the ethical side of our instruction. It is being said that the present generation has less of piety than that which preceded it. If this be granted for the moment, then the blame might attach to the system then in vogue in School and Church. One might be justified in hoping for some change in methods and ideals from those formerly held. But in fact the statement may be challenged as to a lack of real piety. There is less of sentiment; less of pious talk. There may be more real religion.

Of one thing our college authorities must soon become convinced. If the men of ripe scholarship are passed by in selecting those who shall lead our young men and women in their educational efforts, we shall sooner or later be driven to the wall. In this day you cannot hope much longer to keep up an attendance based largely on church loyalty. The writer believes in parents who are Lutheran sending their children to Lutheran schools. However, when once it becomes evident that our own colleges are not keeping pace with the most advanced effort, then is certain to come the time when the parent answers your appeal for church loyalty with his cool stand for family loyalty.

To my mind it becomes more and more evident that one of the best ways to meet the demands of the time lies in the securing of the best men for the class-room instruction. We can get these men even with the modest incomes at our disposal. If we cannot hold them after they have become better known, and the better endowed schools draw from our ranks, yet it is better to have had them and lost them, than never to have had them. Here at Wittenberg there still abides the strong influence of several magnificent teachers years after they have gone elsewhere.

This modern spirit is seen also in the actual work of the col-

lege. Our standards should be elevated; our curricula enlarged and modified; more attention given to scientific lines of work; and the laboratory methods used when possible. Let us note these briefly.

First, as to standards. We ought to do what we do as thoroughly as any school in the land. We should aim at making entrance requirements a little more advanced each year. We ought never to grant a man a diploma unless the work has been well done. Weaklings are to be eliminated, the careless to be made careful, and all to be filled with enthusiasm for work. But that will cost us students. So it will for a while. But if the church colleges are to exist simply to clothe the intellectually weak in the garments of the strong, then we might well wonder if it is worth the effort. The ass in the lion's skin will bray sooner or later.

It will be said that such a course will keep some men out of college and thus out of the ministry. So be it. The Church ought to, and probably will, show its appreciation. There used to be places for the weak men. Fifty years from now there will be no such places. They are getting scarcer every year.

Second, as to the curricula. From an examination of our college catalogues, one who is conversant with the facts can easily see the advance made in this direction during the last twenty years. A graduate of thirty years ago could hardly hope to enter the Sophomore class of today in some departments. This is all very good and in this particular we have kept moving.

Yet, these courses need revision. Outside of German and French our colleges give no attention to modern languages. Not all give even French a chance, and this in face of the fact that a graduate cannot enter certain high grade medical schools without French. We demand a great deal of work in the classics and no one should want less. But in the great state of Ohio with its highly developed High School system there were two years ago only 800 students taking Greek preparatory for college, and last year the number had dropped to about 650. In English, in History, Sociology, Philosophy, there is great

room for modification to meet the demands of the day. If we want students and the best class of students, we must give them what they demand and what they can get elsewhere, or go out of the business.

Third, as to science. Here is our weak spot. For years we failed to note the tendency toward the study of science in its varied forms, or granted only grudgingly what we could no longer withhold. We are reaping the result. There is not to-day in our Church a college with anything like an adequate scientific equipment. Hundreds of our young men, bright and keen to see an opportunity, have turned their backs on our Lutheran institutions and have gone where they could get what they required.

Some of our schools are working now to supply this need, and this can be done in large measure. The college ought to prepare for the technical and professional school as well as for the university. We need first of all on the part of those in authority an accurate knowledge of the situation. This will bring conviction and lead to action. There are high schools to be found with better scientific apparatus and ready to do better work than some of our church schools. Do you think our young people do not know this? A certain college president last fall had to turn away a score of young men because he simply could not promise them some studies that they obtained easily elsewhere. How long is this policy to continue? We need science halls, and costly appliances; we need more men to manage this work; we need laboratories and we need them now.

The last thing suggested is a mere matter of detail. The laboratory method, as it is called, can readily be used to some extent in all our schools. If the modern ideas as to instructors prevail, then there is not much trouble as to method. The earnest student of this day is not disposed to accept the dictum of some assertive teacher simply because the teacher says so and so. The student must investigate, he must know for himself. In the modern class room every student has the opportunity given him for knowing truth at first hand.

2. In the first part of this paper an effort has been made to look at our shortcomings frankly. For some of these the educators and the controlling trustees may have to assume the responsibility. These men have done a great many things and have done them well. Witness the large and influential body of cultured men and women sent out from our Lutheran halls of learning. But it is perhaps true that we have been slow in adapting ourselves to the new education. We have been too conservative.

However, let us not place all the blame upon those who have been placed in charge of our important educational interests. Part of this failure is due to a lack of that without which no college in this day can hope to do great things. *The paramount need of every college, seminary, and academy in our Church is money.*

Now that I have written that sentence it looks so mercenary that the temptation is great to strike it out. Rather than yield, it shall be italicized that it may stand there in all its naked and almost hideous truth. If the writer is charged with low ideals he has an argument to present that will put to everlasting confusion all the pretty dreams of the theorist. Visit our institutions, call upon their executives, examine their treasuries, see the often pitiful effort to maintain a brave show of equality with richly endowed neighboring schools, and then if you are not convinced, the fault lies somewhere else than in the argument.

Let us concede at once that it takes more than massive buildings and large faculties and great laboratories to constitute a college. There are traditions, and loving contact with the great-souled who have toiled and died in reaching the culture ideal; there are devotion to truth through years and the consciousness of being set apart from the world for a season—these and a hundred other indefinable but none the less certain elements that go into the making of a real college. Yet with all these present and a shortage in the current expense fund with no possibility of expansion, there is absolutely no chance for life. The time is surely coming when if life is to be per-



petuated recourse must be had to a saline injection composed largely of silver and gold.

In the olden time, according to the beautiful tale of Homer, the bow of Ulysses hung, useless and unstrung, in the hall of his faithful spouse until its owner returned to show his mastery over the inferior spirits of men. When Penelope brought it in to her suitors she said:

"I bring to you  
The mighty bow that great Ulysses bore.  
Who'er among you he may be, whose hand  
Shall bend this bow, and send through these twelve rings  
An arrow, him I follow hence, and leave  
This beautiful abode of my young years,  
With all its plenty—though its memory,  
I think, will haunt me even in my dreams."

There was none who could bend the bow except Ulysses, who had returned all unknown. With mighty hand he dealt slaughter to all his enemies.

That myth of the poet illustrates our condition by contrast. There are men ready and able to bend the bow, but, alas, there is no bow to bend.

There is a fact in connection with this phase of our needs my that cannot be too strongly impressed upon our people. It is deliberate judgment that with two hundred thousand dollars added to the available resources of Wittenberg College along the lines indicated, our enrollment could be doubled in a few years. No doubt the same is true of other colleges. Further, that amount of money will accomplish more in actual returns if invested with us, than twice the amount when given to some of the large schools where all ideas are exploited on a somewhat extravagant scale. But these schools get their millions and educate their thousands. A Chicago University can attract with tempting salaries men of renown from all the world and look with disdain upon the small college from one of which it secured its distinguished president. We of the denominational school must plod along hopefully, firm in our belief that our golden age is soon to dawn.

Such is our present condition. How long it shall remain no one can tell. There are many reasons for encouragement. Our men of wealth are going to give more to our colleges. If the Lutheran Church ever permits its schools to die, its end will be at hand. This it never will do. There is no need for dejection, for we all believe that God loves our Church and has a distinguished work for it to accomplish in America. The time is coming when the ministry of our faith will lay these educational interests upon the hearts of their people in such an effective manner that there shall be no lack of means to prosecute with vigor and intelligence the great work of Christian education.

## ARTICLE IV.

## THE PROBLEM OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN HIGHER EDUCATION.

By Professor FREDERICK L. SIGMUND, D.D.

It was once true that to speak of the Lutheran Church without direct and extensive reference to the Fatherland was simply not to speak of her at all; when the bulk of the membership lived across the seas and so inconsiderable were the number and influence of those who had come into the states as really not to merit more than a passing notice in the general discussion. That day of small things, however, let us thankfully but also seriously remember, has passed, and the hour of opportunity and responsibility has already come. The Church, which in the eighteenth century was transplanted to American soil, has grown to such proportions and has developed so distinct and individual a character as to be worthy of separate treatment in any general study of Lutheran life and history.

It was also once true that to speak of the Lutheran Church without direct and detailed reference to the achievements of the past, the stirring events of the sixteenth century and the doctrinal development of the seventeenth century, was practically not to speak of her history at all; so that the early struggles of the fathers along the Atlantic coast and in the interior and the gradual expansion of later years were regarded as of comparatively little importance in the general growth and influence of the entire Church. Let us again, with gratitude but also with appreciation of the added responsibility, recognize the larger place which the history and life of American Lutherans occupy in the general operations of the whole Church.

And this must be our attitude especially with reference to the future. While it can not be truthfully said of any portion of our Church, let us hope, that her greatness lies wholly in the past, however heroic or significant that past may have been;

yet with whatever show of truth such an opinion might be urged regarding the churches in Germany and Scandinavia, it can not be held of the Church in America. Our greatness must lie in the future, because our chief service to humanity must then be performed. It will therefore not be improper, in the discussion of the place and work of Lutheranism in education, to turn from the achievements of other days and lands and confine ourselves to the place of American Lutheranism in the field of contemporary education and to the needs of our institutions in the light of existing conditions. For there never has been a period in our life as a Church when the work across the seas availed so little to offset any deficiencies in America, or when so great demands have been made upon us to meet the requirements of competition and of educational advances as at the present time.

One of the significant features of discussions regarding education to-day is the frequent inquiry as to the future of the small college. In many respects the answers to this question, as might be expected, are as varied as the characters of the writers themselves; yet they almost unanimously agree in the prediction that the future is full of much difficulty, if not disaster, for any but the large and liberally endowed institutions.

Now the Lutheran Church is especially interested in the discussion of this question and in the answer that may be given to it; not so much indeed to the predictions of self-appointed prophets, who may or may not be true seers, but to the actual answer of history, which will doubtless be forthcoming during the present half century. For practically all our work in higher education, apart from the actual training of our ministry, is done in the small college; and the great majority of our ministers received their preliminary discipline in connection with these institutions. Of some of the other larger denominations this can also be said; for, generally speaking, the work of Christian education is being done and has hitherto been more largely performed in the so-called small college of America.

In many respects, therefore, the fortunes of religious education and of the small college are linked in origin, development,

influence and prospects. The small college was founded by the Church; its chief support has been derived from the Church; it has grown with the Church; and its hope for the future is largely dependent upon the fidelity and devotion of Christian patrons. On the other hand, the beneficent history of Christian Education has been, in more than one respect, due to the fact that the children of the Church have not been crowded together in great universities and thus lost as individuals in the huge bulk of numbers; but have been trained singly under the direct tuition of experienced men rather than indirectly through the mediation of tutors.

This has been especially the characteristic of Lutheran education. All our undergraduate work, without exception, is done in a small college. Of the forty-three institutions reported at the beginning of the year, not one is a university in size, equipment, departments of study or endowment. Of no other great and historic denomination, it may be said almost without qualification, can this be asserted. Nearly all can point to at least one institution which, by reason of enrollment, endowment, departments of instruction and equipment, can properly use the name of university. Harvard, Yale, Chicago, Northwestern and Princeton occur, among others, as representing directly or indirectly some body or bodies of Christians in the world of higher education.

Of the Lutheran Church it must be confessed, though without discredit because of later organization and greater difficulties in the prosecution of our general work, that thus far no institution of equal rank has been endowed in America. Although Lutheranism was born in a university and has founded more than one great institution in the land of her birth, and although the oldest general body in America owes its very organization to the missionary zeal of the University of Halle, the establishment of a corresponding institution in the land of her adoption has remained as the work of the present or of future generations.

Let us note briefly the situation as regards higher education in the various branches of our Church in America. We have

at present about forty institutions bearing the name of college or university and offering courses in rank above those of secondary schools. Forty-three report a total of 449 instructors in all departments and a total of 7769 students. Thirty-three institutions report 2400 college students and thirty-eight report 3685 enrolled in preparatory departments. These figures show an average of about ten instructors to each school, yet twenty-five report less than ten instructors. An average attendance of seventy-three college students and about one hundred preparatory students is also shown; yet twenty schools fall below an attendance of 150 students and only ten have a total attendance of 250 or more. Of college students not one reports an attendance of 200, and twenty-five have fifty or less. In endowment also our institutions are peculiarly weak. Only four reported a year ago more than \$150,000, and none had more than \$325,000; but the total amount of property set apart to educational uses would amount to fully more than two millions of dollars, since the productive endowment of eleven aggregated over one million dollars.

When, however, we compare these figures with the endowments of the institutions of other leading denominations, the disadvantages under which we have been carrying on our work become apparent. Not to mention the productive endowments of the great universities whose investments reach from five to fifteen millions of dollars, there are the five leading schools of the Methodist Episcopal Church, whose total endowment is over seven millions and whose income is over a million annually, and the two leading universities of the Baptist Church aggregating over seven millions and an income of nearly a million dollars.

We are, therefore, face to face with the general problem of maintaining our institutions and advancing them under these conditions. The question arises, what is to be the future of Lutheranism in education in the twentieth century? What hope have we of meeting the needs of to-day and providing for the demands of to-morrow? How can we catch up with other de-

nominations and meet the competition of secular education? For both these problems must be solved.

A number of subordinate questions, such as that of attendance, the range of instruction, the number of instructors and of income, present themselves in connection with this whole situation. It does not seem improper to urge the opinion that the solution must take into consideration each of these factors, and that no final settlement of the subject can ever be effected without meeting the difficulties that arise in connection with each of them. Our educational problem cannot be solved by attending to each of these figures singly and in turn, but by undertaking, what may seem an impractical plan, the solution of all together. In other words, our institutions, either separately or in concerted movement, seem to be under the necessity of attempting at the same time to increase their attendance, to extend their courses of instruction, to multiply the number of instructors and to add greatly to their income. Otherwise no substantial or permanent advancement seems to be possible at present. Let us therefore consider some suggestions as to the methods most likely to effect this end.

It is unnecessary to remark that by no means all of our young people are attending Lutheran institutions. Out of our immense population there are certainly more than eight thousand academic and college students. And there are certainly many thousands who should be in our institutions who still remain at home or have made an unwise and premature start in their life-work. Making all proper allowance for those who are not and would not be in the several departments of our institutions as constituted at present, it seems that the number enrolled is still disproportionately small.

How may the tide of Lutheran young people who are attending secular institutions or hurrying into business be turned in the direction of the schools of their own Church? Certainly whatever effort is being made to enlist their interest and the interest of their guardians must be continued with redoubled zeal. At the foundation of all successful agitation is the positive, active, persevering coöperation of all the leaders in



the Church. Pastors, laymen, alumni, parents, students and prospective students each can contribute an important share of influence which shall determine the decision of many young people. Yet, more important than any others in their responsibility are the natural leaders of the Church, the pastors and the influential laymen. It is invariably the result that in territory where these coöperate harmoniously the progress of the institution is healthy and constant.

The Church may learn a lesson from the politician. "Get together" is the cry as they face an approaching election. Party counsel may be divided and factions may struggle for the mastery, but in the face of a common enemy all stand together or all meet overwhelming defeat. It were well if, in the counsels of the Church, a sharper distinction were to be drawn between the fundamental and the non-essential topics of controversy; so that what has too often arrayed a portion of the Church against an administration to the detriment of the institution might be kept within proper limits and not have hindered the efficiency or progress of the school.

Another lesson may profitably be learned from the methods of the state schools in the appointment of so-called high school examiners, who are really only agents for the universities among the secondary schools of the state. This system of affiliation does much to attach the students to the university long before they are prepared to leave their homes. It is simply the application of the principle of bringing skillful and trained men into personal contact with prospective students, by which at an important period in their education interest is excited in the higher institution. Now such a representative of each of our institutions would more than provide for the expense of his maintenance by the results of his canvass, even if his whole time were to be given to this work. And it seems that some such method of representation must be adopted in order to offset the alienating influences which are now at work.

This suggests the general question of administration. One need not risk successful contradiction by the assertion that none of our institutions is expending either enough of time or money

in the management of its affairs. One wonders that they advance at all when one considers what meagre allowances are voted for work so vital to all business enterprises. From motives of economy, the custom has grown almost universal to make the administration of an institution a part of the duty of a professor, who is expected to carry almost full work in the class-room and beside to manage the business affairs and to represent the school on the territory. Or, the administration has been divided and two or more professors are thus subjected to the inconvenience and distractions which such a distribution of labor invariably occasions.

Now the consequences have invariably been harmful to all parties concerned. It is acknowledged that no two classes of intellectual labor require so different a temperament and mode of life as the work of teaching and of administration. The successful teacher must be a student, widely and thoroughly acquainted with the facts and literature of the courses which he expects to conduct, who needs much time for careful investigation and reading, and who, above all, should not be distracted by frequent interruptions and a variety of practical duties. On the other hand, the life of an executive is one of constant interruptions and distractions. Every day brings a great variety of business and forces upon him many questions which must be decided quickly and finally. To advance his work he must be constantly on the alert, quick to take advantage and to press the issue. He can have little time for study or reading and none at all for prolonged and careful investigation. Necessarily he must depend on others for this service; and any literary employments with which he may occupy himself in leisure hours must be his avocation, not the main business of life. His vocation is ever in the active, busy world of affairs. Change of work and environment, irregularity of living and working, are inseparable from his very life. How is it possible for one man to combine these diverse qualities and successfully to labor in such unrelated lines of work? It is not strange that very few in the whole world of education have exhibited talent in both directions or have been successful in each position.

Yet the ordinary denominational college compels her president and some of her professors to live such a divided existence, often spoiling a good executive in the attempt to make a teacher and bringing harm to an institution by compelling an otherwise excellent teacher to waste his time on business details. It might be a revolution, but it would be a wholesome one, if every college in the Church were to separate the duties of the class-room from those of administration, and to assign to one man the whole responsibility for the management of the institution, internally as well as externally, providing him with all necessary assistance and requiring him to be an educational executive, not a teacher. What has been found necessary and practicable in the larger institutions of the state would prove both wise and economical in our smaller schools.

A fact of recent history, familiar to many, may serve to reinforce this argument for greater attention to administration in our educational work. When Harper & Brothers failed several years ago, it was generally regarded in the business world as due to dependence on a record and a name, and to antiquated methods of doing business. In spite of the changes that had taken place in the business world, the firm had not moved with their competitors. Their letters, it was said, were all written with pen and ink; old methods of advertising were followed; the same style and grade of books were published year after year; and in the appointment of heads of departments the members of the family were given the preference over the tried and faithful employees of years. The change that has followed the re-organization of this historic house has included the introduction of new blood into the management, the recognition of faithful service in the appointments and the adoption of modern methods of doing business. In our own competition for the patronage of the educational public it will be equally necessary for us to adjust ourselves to the changes of business methods, else we, too, shall suffer the consequences of unreasonable adherence to policies which have been superseded in the world at large.

But of more value than any special form of advertising is the

repeated emphasis by pastors and others to parents and children regarding the supreme importance of education, so as to stimulate the young to desire and to seek a larger culture than they should otherwise consider necessary for their success in life. Indifference to self-culture, absorption in business and sometimes discouragement because hopes seem unlikely to be realized are, under ordinary conditions, the chief causes of the depleted attendance in our institutions of higher education. It is by overcoming the tendencies to shorten the period of study and to satisfaction with something less than genuine training that especial service can be rendered by those who come into closest contact with our young people. The school can do but little to stimulate a proper ambition, if the home and the Church do not foster it. No form of coöperation is more urgently needed to-day nor can any confer a more lasting benefit on the young than this earnest presentation of the joys and utility of thorough intellectual discipline. Apart from this positive emphasis upon the advantages of culture little good will be accomplished by our warning against the dangers of secular education. Such exhortations and admonitions only serve to advertise our rivals without benefitting ourselves, and may settle in some minds a conviction against any higher education at all.

Yet if every means suggested for the enlargement of our colleges were to be faithfully applied, they, as they are at present constituted, could not secure one-half the students that might otherwise be in attendance. By no means all of our young people are able or inclined to pursue literary courses. Many are compelled to enter business or to begin teaching to obtain a livelihood. Others, from natural inclination, select technical and scientific courses which are not to be obtained outside the universities. Still others, who would remain after graduation for further study, are compelled to go elsewhere on account of inadequate facilities for such specialization.

There are other reasons why the Church should provide these additional courses. The organization of our colleges is no longer determined by the sole purpose for which they were originally founded, to furnish the Church with an educated

ministry. The Church was unable in the day of their founding to attempt more than this; but the situation is wholly different to-day. The Church has grown in numbers and wealth, and with this enlargement has been the proportionate increase of the number of those who seek better opportunities in education than the secondary schools afford. These young people are going somewhere, and the Church should feel the obligation to provide for them every possible facility to secure the needed training. This lack hitherto and the great difficulty to provide it now do not seem to relieve us of responsibility to do so speedily. Are not the characters of those who desire technical, normal and business education equally precious with those who choose the literary courses? If it is the purpose of Christian education to throw about the student healthy moral and religious influences, who shall say that those who select the traditional classical courses are in need of such influences more than others or that they who seek another preparation for life are less deserving of similar safeguards? If Christian Education aims at more than an educated ministry, the Church is bound to offer all her children equally an opportunity for training under wholesome influences.

The children of this world have been wiser in their generation than the children of light. If it has been profitable for private parties, without the prestige or natural advantages which Christian schools invariably possess, to organize and maintain normal schools, business colleges, conservatories of music, not to speak of technical schools which necessarily require more expensive equipment, why might not this policy also prove profitable for the Church? Where such an extension of the original plan of religious education has been attempted and has been judiciously managed it has to no small extent served to help the solution of the financial problem of other departments.

Without doubt the needs and ability of the territory of each institution and, to a large extent, the local demands of the community in which the institution is situated, must determine both the number and the character of the additional courses to be offered. In all plans, however, it is the part of wisdom to con-

sider the needs rather than the demands. Service is finally the secret of success in education as in everything else. The institution which most largely benefits the public secures and holds the patronage of the public. No institution liveth unto itself or to its Board of Trustees or Faculty. The determining factor is the actual needs of the territory and the community; and that management is wise indeed which seeks promptly and thoroughly to supply the existing deficiency. A patronage which will more than compensate, directly or indirectly, for the expense incurred can not fail ultimately to be secured. Aside from the financial returns of such a venture, the ties which bind the institution to its natural constituency can not fail of being more closely knit by such evident effort to serve. The wealth of public-spirited donors outside the Church can be secured only by such a proof of genuine helpfulness to society. And there are millions at the disposal of institutions to-day where thousands could not be obtained fifty years ago.

Is it not possible for each of our institutions within a few years to embody in the curriculum much more than is being attempted by any of them now? Can not some few, at least, follow the example of every university which is more than fifty years old? For each of them has sprung from humble beginnings and, according to the needs and opportunities of its situation, has expanded until the ampler proportions of these latter years have been attained. Such a development surely is not restricted to non Lutheran institutions. There is probably just as distinguished and influential a future before some of our own institutions as ever dawned upon any in the past. But the path by which this field of larger influence and more varied activity was reached has been that of efficient service and ambitious effort toward larger things. There is absolutely no circumstance in the situation of any of our schools which makes impossible the realization of such an ideal. Some of the world's greatest universities have been located amidst the most unfavorable surroundings; yet they have lived and grown in spite of them. As it is the character of the teachers and of the students that determines the greatness of the institution, so it is

the character of the governing body and of the constituency which finally determines in all essentials whether the school shall grow to large usefulness or whether it shall have only a restricted and incomplete existence.

Evidently the addition of any considerable number of courses will necessitate an increase in the force of instructors. In consequence of this extension the necessity of providing for the additional expense will thereby be incurred. Undoubtedly this latter difficulty has ever been the chief hindrance to the proper enlargement of our faculties. Yet our Boards of Trustees do not seem to have served their institutions most wisely in allowing this difficulty to stand in the way of decided and extensive enlargement of the corps of instructors.

Even under present conditions it may be truthfully said that there are not enough instructors for the departments already organized. Every faculty in the Church ought to be increased. There is reason in the division and sub-division of the departments in the larger colleges and universities which is not wholly due to the increase of students or courses, but to the inability of any instructor to render efficient service with a large number of subjects. It is not enough to say that no one can teach many subjects in the college courses equally well; it were almost always true to say that he can not teach *any* of them really well. In a day when knowledge is so widely extended and information in such minute detail is required for efficient instruction, when the very best work of the teacher is none too good for the pupil and when the test of efficiency is being more and more rigidly applied to every instructor, it is unjust to all concerned for the Church to require her professors to perform the variety and quantity of work that is ordinarily being imposed. Not to mention the impossibility of the instructor's own development under such a policy, much less his keeping fully in touch with the advances in his own departments, it is sufficient to call attention to the unnecessary and excessive wear on body and mind which such conditions involve.

Nor are the disadvantages limited to the instructor. Unable



to accomplish the best work for himself or his pupils, the teacher will inevitably require less of them in the class-room. Wearing from excessive tasks, if he should still persevere in independent study, he will be unable to impart his information with the vigor, clearness or freshness which are required in order to interest and especially to stimulate the student also to do his best; and thus insensibly, even though contrary to natural desire, the average of work performed by the class will decrease in quantity and quality, until all concerned awake to the unhappy situation for which those least responsible are often blamed.

Now regarding the expense of additional instructors it may be remarked that the addition of a really good teacher is equivalent to the increase of the capital of the institution. It is impossible to secure the services of a capable instructor and properly to make his presence known, without reaping the benefit through an increase of the number of students. This is especially true if the addition be also one of departments. Where care is exercised in the selection of courses, the first year ought to justify the wisdom of such expansion and the second or third year should establish it as a permanent feature of the institution.

It is not necessary that excessive salaries be paid for famed instructors. Professors even in colleges need not be authorities in original research or producers of text books. It is hardly desirable that many in any faculty be of this number. Yet in such departments in which graduate study is to be encouraged it were well to secure the services of such instruction. For subordinate positions and for academic courses it is unnecessary, indeed it is undesirable, that specialists be chosen. It is far more important that they be *men*, with true sympathy for their pupils and with insight into their nature to supplement the information they wish to impart. There are true teachers to day, as there have always been, who teach for the love of it, without the itching for gold or prominence which characterizes the hireling. Our own Church is producing scores of them each year; among the number are the very best scholars

receiving their degrees from the leading universities. Shall a timid or penurious economy on our part drive them into other institutions to enrich their faculties and to add to the burden of competition? It is not unlikely that a large university could be wholly furnished to-day with distinguished and capable instructors of Lutheran stock who are employed in institutions outside of the Lutheran Church.

Yet, conditioning all and the most difficult in many respects, is the problem of finance. Where and how shall the income to defray these suggested improvements be provided? This is the cold business proposition which confronts the Church. Not all will have been done in the event of its being provided, but to most minds the chief obstacle will have been removed.

It were well to remember at the beginning that, unless the Church propose to advance in education and actually make the start, no funds for these improvements will ever be forthcoming. It is the courage to move forward and risk that stimulates co-operation and that will open purses for defraying the expense. All the world is aroused by sentiment, and without it no advance of civilization would even be attempted. The present life and progress of America are an evidence of its power. It was sentiment of the truest and purest sort that produced and sustained the Revolutionary war, the Civil war, the deliverance and relinquishment of Cuba and the occupation of the Philippines. All denominational education is the evidence of its power. If the amount necessary had been in sight when the beginning was made, no Christian education would be ever undertaken and not a single advance could have been made. Yale started with a few books and a few dollars and now possesses five millions of endowment. Had a calculating policy been adopted not a Lutheran institution would be in the land. The need existed; that need was recognized; Christian men prayed and gave what they were able and trusted for the divine increase. Secular schools must needs have the resources of the state behind them, because they have nothing else; but the Christian school, like the Christian Church, possesses a vitality and draws its sustenance from sources which can not be

destroyed or taken away. A larger realization of this fact, together with an appreciation of the obligations which accompany it, is a great desideratum in the present situation.

Yet how considerable are the resources which appear to human eyes as the encouragement of every Lutheran institution in the land? A student roll, large or small; a growing list of alumni; an equipment of building; possibly an endowment fund, also increasing; a corps of instructors, a constituency and a history—these are the assets of each institution. Surely not an inconsiderable guarantee of life and growth upon the basis of past achievement. Each of these factors can be utilized, like the loaves and fishes of the miracle, for the supply of the educational needs of our increasing population. The enrollment can be swelled, in part at least, by the loyal and wisely directed efforts of the students themselves. The *esprit de corps* of more than one institution has been the efficient cause of steady and permanent growth in the past. The bulwark of every institution is its company of alumni, true, energetic, enthusiastic and generous, with the wisdom of maturity utilized for service in behalf of their alma mater, for whose prosperity the love of former years has kindled a practical enthusiasm. The constituency, which has steadily increased with the years, can be depended upon for more generous support in response to an earnest, intelligent, practical appeal. Thus every portion of the field of our institutions may contribute powerfully toward a progress that is heartily and confidently undertaken.

A wise method of enlisting the coöperation of the alumni and the constituency has been that of increasing their representation on the Board of Trustees. Loyalty can best be fostered among those whose voices are heard in the councils of the institution. Alumni recognize this right and appreciate the privilege; so also do patrons of the school in the locality in which it is situated. Among the wisest and truest counselors of some of our institutions have been men of means and business capacity whose only connection with the Lutheran Church has been through her schools.

Above all must we remember that they who have these in-

stitutions as their own possession, who stand for the educational support and advancement of each, and whom the world shall judge or approve according to the measure with which each shall meet the requirements of its position—they must make it what it should be. The pastors and laymen on the territory of each college, like the pastor and laymen of each congregation, are responsible for what their institution accomplishes and for the degree and rapidity of its advancement. There can be no escape from this burden, heavy though it may be, and how far soever it may seem to exceed their ability. No general support through organized boards or wealthy patrons at a distance can relieve them of this obligation; and the longer the hour of assuming this burden is postponed, the more severe the trial to heart and brain. Yet no man liveth to himself or dieth to himself. No individual or district of the Church can live in selfish disregard of the needs of others. The educational progress of the East imposes the obligation to help the needy and struggling West. No better dividends can possibly be secured than are offered in some of these western educational enterprises.

Above all must it be remembered that they who, in God's providence, have been blessed with large possessions are under heaviest obligation to give liberally and promptly toward this important work. No benevolent cause in the Church depends so completely upon the extent and promptitude of their generosity. Colleges can not be maintained and developed to-day with penny collections. Temporary relief may be provided through small contributions, but the bulk of their support must come from the rich. The gifts of the poor to education must ever be their sons and daughters, a most valued, indeed a precious, bounty; but the rich alone can give their children and their wealth. If the children be denied them, their obligation is doubly impressive to bestow their goods so that the children of others may obtain what their own should certainly have secured. Thus poor and rich together may extend God's kingdom by the training of the young.

During the Crusades, we are told, men dedicated themselves, their possessions, and even their kingdoms, in order that the

Holy Sepulchre might be wrested from the hands of the infidel; may we not believe that, in these latter days, the Church of the Reformation in America may also devote herself as fully to the sacred cause of Christian Education in order that her sons and daughters may be delivered from ignorance or worldly culture unto the knowledge and obedience of the truth, even the truth as it is in Christ Jesus?



## ARTICLE V.

## THE EDUCATION REQUIRED BY THE TIMES.

BY PROFESSOR E. B. KNERR, Sc.D.

These are the days of "the new." So many new things have been found better than the old that frequently a sufficient recommendation and assurance of acceptance for an article or a movement is the demonstration that it is new, "up-to-date," "suited to the times." In automobiles, ranges, sewing-machines, bicycles, we want the "model of 1904." That of 1903 can no longer bring the full market price. It is on the "bargain counter" now.

And so we have the "new education," the "twentieth century model."

There are not wanting men to decry all this, men who are continually harking back to the "good old times," men whose sum-total of philosophy is that what was good enough for our very superior grandfathers certainly should be good enough for these degenerate days.

But are they right? We know they are not, as a moment's thought will reveal. The makers of the "1904" machine have built in on the experience of previous models, removing this and that defect and carrying its efficiency a degree higher. They want a machine to do the work of today, and the models of previous years are sold for what they may bring, or thrown into the junk heap.

Likewise with education. What is wanted here and now is

not that which was so good for Washington and Jefferson, Lincoln and Garfield, or even McKinley and Roosevelt; but that which will be the very best for Teddie, Jr., and Quenton, and the sixty millions of their juvenile compatriots. It is preposterous to suppose that pedagogical perfection was reached about the middle of the nineteenth century, and that therefore nothing new of value could ever be discovered and appropriated for the American educational system.

In the "model" machine of new date the fundamental principles of previous types are retained, and frequently the new feature is nothing more than a new flourish in the setting of the manufacturer's name, but that brings it "up to date." So our systems of education, however changed, must maintain certain fundamental principles as old as the human family, but as advancement is made these principles must be enriched and enlarged to fit the times. They, too, must be brought "up to date," and it will not do to clothe the twentieth century youth in the cast off garments of the last and previous centuries, even in matters educational.

There is a new education for the rising generation, and the innovations are not all "flourish, fad and finish." These innovations go deeper than usual, and that is why they are attracting so much attention. Never before in the whole history of the subject have educational interests awakened such wide spread and earnest discussion as at the present time. The result is bound to be highly beneficial. It will clear the field of much worthless lumber and build thereon an educational system suited to the times, an eminently natural system with but one aim, that of growth for the individual, the whole individual.

A man's schooling has its beginning when he first opens his eyes to the light of day, but it never ends. That is trite. The term "schooling" is a figure borrowed to describe the discipline incident to the acquiring of capacity to adjust existence to environment to advantage. A man's effort in that direction ends only in the stagnation of the grave, for so long as he lives his surroundings are continually changing. With each shifting he has a new point of view to be adjusted, a new plane in which to

establish his equilibrium, only to find that meanwhile he has suffered a new perturbation of circumstance which now must claim renewed attention to adjustment.

Education is the drawing out of capacity for equipoise, for adaptability,—and a little more—for mastery; so that the educated man is the master of the situation, the directing agent, and not the driven. He is the educated man who in any circumstance can instantly "get his bearing" and do his work. He is the educated man who "is there with the goods"—to use a bit of expressive slang—when the demands are upon him whether they be social at the feasts or fasts of his fellow men, whether they be commercial in the straits of business perplexity, whether they meet him in the emergencies of threatened calamity, or at the knock of rare opportunity, or at the simplest turn of duty.

The foundations for such results must be laid in childhood and early youth, but the full consummation, if ever attained, can come only with mature years. A young man's education should give him ability to express the most in his life of which his constitution, mental, physical and spiritual, is capable. To this end all of the old that is advantageous should be enlisted and everything new, as well, that can be of help. The aim must be not to make finished men and women at graduation from the formal school, for that is impossible; but to develop in them by that time a capacity to become true men and true women under the discipline of their further life experiences. The aim of a theological seminary should be, not so much to make preachers, for no seminary ever did that, as to develop a possibility in young men to become preachers under the discipline of actual service. The work of an engineering school is not to turn out competent, finished engineers. That is impossible. The purpose can only be to train young men in such a way that they may become good engineers as soon as possible under the exigencies and by the experiences of actual commercial work. The mistaken idea is too prevalent that the business of the "professional" schools is to actually accomplish the making of professional men, whereas the utmost that



the very best of them can do is to prepare their students to become, in the years after leaving school, professional men worthy of their calling.

I dwell on this point for the reason that whenever a suggestion is made for the introduction of courses other than purely mental in their application, at once a charge of gross commercialism is preferred against any such innovation; as if the purpose of manual training schools were to make expert carpenters and blacksmiths. If the production of the expert is beyond the hope of the advanced technical schools how is such a result to be expected from the manual-training high-school? True, certain practical advantages must result from such work, to which no one can in reason object, but the main benefits are broadly cultural and it is because of these that the advocates of the later methods are so enthusiastic in their cause.

What should be the equipment of a young man with the greatest promise of success in life? What course in education will insure that equipment.

In reply, we will say that the man should be of sound physique. With proper attention to the plain laws of health, in the great majority of cases this may be assured. People sin mostly against their health knowingly, therefore the importance of always keeping well should be impressed on the mind of the child at the earliest possible moment. That is first the responsibility of the parents. As all tendency to physical deformity or mishap should be carefully guarded against from the very day of birth, so all tendency to moral obliquity should find immediate correction. This too is at first an obligation of the home, then of the school, the Church and of the individual. Along with the growth of body and establishment of moral rectitude should go a development of mental and spiritual capacity.

It is this development of mind which has been mostly aimed at in educational systems heretofore. The new education, that for the present and coming time, goes much farther. It has for its watchword: "Send the whole child to school!" Aye, and send his parents and teachers too. Let it be recognized

that education has begun before the school room is entered, and it is by no means complete at "graduation." To insure a physically strong child the parents should give constant attention to the plain common-sense safe guards to health. Parents and teachers must have an uncompromising regard for rectitude to instill in the minds of the children a high respect for right.

And the discipline must be of the whole child,—physical, mental, moral, spiritual. His first teacher should be a good mother. His "play" is a means of education. Even in that he should early be made acquainted with the joy that comes of conquering. When things do not go right he should be encouraged to make them go right. As a child he should be encouraged to be the master of his "play," and when he is a man he will surely be the master of his work. This spirit of mastery in his own domain cannot be too early or too much encouraged. So will we become a race of conquerors in the best sense. It is only when this pleasure of mastery tempts the child or man to exert his powers in another's domain that it should be curbed and the child or man shown his place. The child's whole schooling is one triumphs and defeats, as is indeed the man's whole life. But the schoolboy whose triumphs in tasks are the most frequent will be by and by the man whose defeats will be the fewest.

But these child triumphs must be in every line. Many a "bright" schoolboy has known triumphant ways with his lessons only to meet defeat after defeat in life. Why? Because his schooling was so defective. His mental tasks were set before him, and he himself was minutely directed in a prescribed way whereby they might be accomplished. He followed the rules and obtained the expected results. It was all a matter of prescribed methods and that was the end of it. He fell back on no resources of his own, for there was no call for that, so he never developed any. When his days of "school" and perfect recitations were over and he was thrown on his own efforts he fell flat with nothing to sustain him. The old education is responsible for many such a failure. Success came to

the ones who ran out on their own lines to some degree. Though their school-room records were not so flattering, as boys they had met problems of their own initiative and had mastered them. Theirs were the kites which stood steady in the breeze; theirs were the pockets well filled with marbles; theirs were the longest strings of fish; theirs was the victor's crown even in the school-time days, though the schoolmaster's faulty record book failed to so credit them.

The education for the times must take this fact into account. It must not leave these various traits of the child-being to work out their own salvation paying heed only to the child-mind as did the old. Its methods must be largely those of the kindergarten principles extended. A fundamental principle is, that whatever will naturally hold the attention is of most value for development in any line. Therefore the play of the child is wisely sized upon as a first means of appeal and as a foothold in the task of education to be accomplished. Tasks in "play" are set, and when they are done and the difficulties overcome, how happy the child! Even so the man in his "work," in his "aims"; when it is all accomplished, how pleased the man! After all, what is "play"; what is "work"? Are they not one when properly pursued? Are they not both, activities of body, mind and soul toward a purpose, whether that be successfully to draw a toy cart by a string without overturning it, or to drive a ninety-ton locomotive at seventy miles per hour from New York to Chicago without ditching it?

In its purpose to send the whole boy to school the new education is calling to account certain defects in the old, and is pressing for needed reform. The tendency heretofore has been to prolong mental effort along certain lines to a degree out of all proportion to the benefits derived. These lines have been mainly in linguistic studies and to much formal text-book recitation. Now there is nothing better for mental discipline and development than the study of language and practice in recitations—up to a certain point. Beyond that the benefits are small indeed as compared with the time and effort expended. According to the old idea a student cannot study too much lan-

guage, and he is encouraged to take up one after another. But to what purpose? To little more than a criminal waste of time. "Linguists" who profess a familiarity with a half-dozen or more languages are not rare. Many of these have spent their lives in the study of languages, and yet few there are who can work satisfactorily in any of them save one, their mother tongue. True, these "linguists" are adepts in translation so far as the mere matching of words goes, but when it comes to a correct, practical and artistic use of any language other than their mother tongue they are frequently a laughing stock for the natives.

But it is sometimes argued that all this time is well spent on foreign languages, living, dying and dead, inasmuch as it opens up to the student "the beauties of the original" "which can never be conveyed fully in translation." I quote this cant, for it is as old as the first professorship of Greek or Latin ever established. To have any adequate appreciation of any literature the mind must be able to think and reason freely in the language of that literature. Now, how many of the thousands of our English speaking youth who have worried through portions of the Iliad with a Greek lexicon at their elbows could spontaneously think ten sentences in correct Greek? Not one. How many of the tens of thousands who have worn the pages of their Horace and thumb-worn the precious notes in the appendix could think two lines of original artistic Latin? Not another! An expert who had bent years of his life to the effort might be capable of the feat, but to offer this old argument as an inducement to undergraduates to study the dead languages is the height of absurdity. Indeed he is a rare student who has any depth of appreciation for the good things, the artistic things in the literature of his own mother tongue. Why? Because they are very few indeed who are capable of spontaneously artistic thought.

But, if a student really wishes to comprehend somewhat of the beauty of a "Prometheus Bound," let him read Mrs. Browning's version in English. That is as near as he will ever come to Aeschylus, unless he sets out with the definite purpose of

making Greek poetry a specialty for life and so masters the language that his daily contact with the world about him would find conscious expression in his thought in Greek as readily as in English. How many, think you, attain to such proficiency?

It has been charged by the critics that Pope's *Iliad* is Pope's, and little of Homer's. Is that not true of every translation? What think you, then, will the college freshman make of the *Blind Bard* in a semester of effort?

Yet there is much good in the study of languages, and the new education will hold fast to it in so far as it is profitably valuable. Beyond that it will drop it, for there is no time to be wasted in the support of a bald sentiment. Enough Latin and Greek should be studied by all to reveal the etymological bearing of these languages on the English. But this purpose should be kept constantly in mind and the work planned accordingly. Their study should also be followed for sufficient time to give the mind the valuable discipline that comes from practise in translation. With this use kept in view, two or three years at most for both combined is certainly ample, except, of course, in cases where the student expects to make the study of language a specialty. Even in this event he will do best by taking them up again later on as a specialist.

The valuable time thus rescued from the excessive and purposeless reading of a multitude of authors in foreign languages will be utilized by the present-day education in the development of other capacity in the man, such as cunning of hand, keenness of eye and ear, soul power for the fuller appreciation of man for his fellowman and all nature about him.

The old "classical education" pre-empted a great claim when it labeled itself "humanistic." Its assumption, by implication at least, that all else is necessarily barbaric, heathen, savage, gross, is somewhat pharisaical, to say the least. Because a young man has tied his hands behind his back for seven years while he devoted his mind to philosophy, mathematics and linguistics, carries with it no assurance whatever that the devotee has become any more of a man thereby. Indeed he has lost power in a very essential respect, perchance. He has be-

come a weakling in a part of his nature. Too frequently he fails to catch that practical, commonsense view of life which for the present times is pre-eminent in any man's equipment. The new education comes to him and bids him free his hands. It reminds him that they were given him for a purpose, and he is to use them. There is no reason for assuming that such freedom will necessarily detract from æsthetic or any others "humanistic" capacity. The architecture of today, for example, is more wonderful and more beautiful than that of any age. Our steel and marble palaces are constructed with a nicety of plan and a beauty of ornamentation over which the ancients would stand agape, could they but see it. And they are the work of freed hands.

The day of broad things is at hand,—the day of generous, though of kindly recognition of the value of ability in whatever sphere it may manifest itself for good. Time was when the man of books, and old books alone, was the worshipful "scholar," but now he who can best find his balance with all the forces of nature and society about him and be a master in it all, is the *man*. The new education has set itself to the task of his making, and the making of as many of him as possible.

The state is in the advance in this movement in its educational institutions. Is the Church going to place its schools in line, or is she going to continue to recommend to her sons and daughters that the back is a very restful position for folded hands? At one end of the public school system in almost every city and town of the land is the kindergarten, gaining firmer hold as its value is appreciated, and at the other end is the manual training high-school, with its shop work for the boys, and girls even in some instances, and its kitchen work for the girls and to some extent for the boys too. The purpose is not directly to make skilled mechanics or trained cooks, as too many seem to think and condemn this course because their ill-informed notions are not realized. The aim of this new feature in education is purely cultural in that its purpose is to implant in the minds of the boys and girls ideals of what really constitutes trained mechanics and skilled cooks and at the same

time to start them right in the way of eventually realizing those ideals in after life if need be. It is not expected that every boy who takes such a course in the school shops will eventually become a proficient mechanical engineer, or that every girl is to become an expert cook—though blessed would be that consummation. Right ideals in any walk in life are helpful to all. If a boy learn to dress a block of steel accurate to measurement to a thousandth of an inch, though that block may be consigned to the junk heap the next day, he is benefitted beyond measure for any calling the future may hold for him. His eye has learned an accuracy otherwise unknown; his hand has gained a deftness otherwise unacquired; but best of all the boy has come into the possession of a moral conception of the value of doing things just right which will fortify his personal attitude for righteousness ever afterward, no matter what is calling in life may be.

The advocates of the old education are disposed to look somewhat contemptuously on school shop work as "play"; and as they seldom condescend seriously to consider the philosophy of "play" and the part it holds in human life, they attach but small value to it. They are inclined to regard manual training courses and laboratory practise as easy, and offered merely to please the fancy of pupils. All I have to say to such critics is, let them once attempt to direct the simplest laboratory or shop practise and they will soon beg to return to their cushioned chairs, spectacles and lexicons. No class of teaching is so trying of patience or more draining on nerve force. The pupils may take eagerly to the work, but they must be wisely handled from the very first, or they will soon conceive a distaste for it. They, too, will soon conclude that it is much easier to sit in a chair and recite than to go into the laboratory and demonstrate. Somehow the best of us are averse to physical exertion, even the slightest, until—until some high motive is discoverable, and then no effort can be too severe. The wise instructor seizes on this fact and early strives to have his pupils gain a feeling for the high motive of their work. "Anybody can make boxes;" yes, and anybody can build fences, as



a visit to any negro community will demonstrate. But the point is not the making of a *box*; it is rather the *making of the box*. In the effort ambition is awakened to make the very best box possible, with perfect dovetailing and true measurement. When the task is done, there is the pleasure of conquering as a reward, and the student is eager for new difficulties to master. The student is now at work; he is entirely past the "play" stage the critic so deprecates as all there is to these new-fangled excuses to humor the pupil in his desire to escape as much of his books as possible. Books have been so long the sole tools of formal education that many people find a difficulty in comprehending that there may be other means which might be employed to better advantage in some respect.

The writer recently heard the president of a denominational college assert in discussing this subject that if he had his life to live over and were privileged to choose his own education in the light of his experience, he would go back to the same country school of forty years ago, to the same old master and pursue substantially the course which he did follow, church-college, seminary and all, were that choice set over against anything offered today. The statement was unique inasmuch as most men in reviewing their past lives mark almost every stage with pauses of regret. Surely if educational methods have made no advance in the past forty years they must be ready now to take a tremendous leap forward.

I, too, nearly forty years ago first invaded the country school at the cross-roads of a fertile Ohio valley, and as I now look back over my experiences in the school room—where, by the way, I have been without interruption ever since—I would choose far differently were the privilege of education again offered me. I would most certainly choose the advantages of the present-day position in education. Were I again a child of five years I do hope my parents would not send me to that country school, which, however, was as good, doubtless, as any over in Pennsylvania, for the schools were all very much alike in that day. Distinctly do I remember my first "lesson." A McGuffey's spelling book was placed in my hands, a child of five, remember, and I was told to learn the words on the first page!

Is it any wonder I have suffered a species of mental incapacity ever since when it comes to matters of orthography? Would I choose to go back to that? Not if I were in my sane mind. But here is about what I would choose were I permitted to begin my formal education again:

I would begin at five as formerly, but the first year would be purely kindergarten work: child songs, child rhymes, child action, child use of the hands in making things. I have heard my mother say that as a little child I used to sing a great deal. That spelling-book ordeal must have frightened from me whatever capacity I ever had in that line, for I certainly have none now. From the very first to the very last I would choose that my hands should be learning to do something, growing in skill, for after all this is but a phase of mental development. The hands can fashion only after the conceptions of the mind. As the skill of the hands grows, the mental conceptions will take on more perfect and more definite form. So the drawing of pictures, the fashioning of letters and figures should claim the attention of the child for a long time, for it takes years to bring the muscles of hands to become obedient servants of the mind.

Further, I would choose that my instructors give constant attention to the improvement of my whole physical bearing. Grace of carriage may be developed even in a lad from the country. I would choose also that my earliest notions of right and wrong be placed on a sound basis. I would also choose that my attention be frequently directed to the beauty of things about me, that a refined taste may be cultivated. All this could go on throughout the years of childhood ever adding to the sum total which is finally to expand into a full rounded manhood.

I would have my while schooling fashioned on a two fold plan, the two features supplementing each other all along the course. The first should be for culture and the second should be for equipment, more especially. The elements which make for culture in a sense also make for equipment, for unless a man is cultured his equipment serves him but lamely for any

worthy calling. The cultural elements are general and may be turned to account in any vocation. The equipment is particular, and is of value chiefly on special lines. Because of the broadly general nature of the former its interests should be looked after mostly in the earlier years of the student's life. But the beginnings of special equipment need not be long delayed, as has been all too universally the practise of education in the past and for which it is now called in judgment. All the more is this neglect to be condemned when it must be recognized that exercises which develop physical skill also tend in a great measure to the refinement of taste; and refined taste is the soul of true culture.

Every self-respecting man should be self-supporting by the time he has reached his majority, and he should depend on his own resources ever after. This choice I would make for myself, and I would demand that my formal education should be done by that time and that it should by that time have given me sufficient equipment to earn me a living. This the new education can do, and the world is demanding that it should do this much. By the old education after a series of "commencements," first from the graded schools, then from the high-school or academy, then from the college, and finally from the professional school, the very much "graduated" student is launched into "life" at twenty-five to thirty years of age, depending on his absorbent abilities, and yet no more capable of earning a living than a boy of nineteen.

No, I would not choose that road a second time; but this I would do: I would pursue the primary schools till I was thirteen years of age, or through the seventh grade. Then I would seek out some institution, preferably under church control, and follow a course broadly cultural for the first three or six years, but grading more distinctively to professional lines in the latter three. I would prefer a church school to a high-school or other state institution at this stage in my education, for the reason that the church schools are seldom over-crowded, though it must be admitted that they are sometimes distressingly and disastrously small. At any rate the pupils are regarded as individual human beings, and not as a herd of sheep

to be driven as a flock with the devil to take the hindmost and the wolves to get the wayward. Then there is a spirit of reverence in the atmosphere of such a place, a reverence for all high and noble things. The administration is more pliable and may yield more readily to serving the needs of the individual student than is at all possible where a thousand or more must be controlled. Where there is a spirit of reverence for good things, there is also a genuine sympathy extended to all, that is indeed helpful.

Because of this pervading spirit of respect which arises as a direct result of religious influence and which makes for the development of the true gentleman and the true gentle-woman more than anything else, I would choose the denominational institution as against all others if I could only find there what I have a right to claim for my physical development and beginnings of professional equipment as well as for my mental discipline.

By physical development I mean vastly more than is included in "physical culture" and "athletics." They afford but a small part indeed of true physical development. Most of our schools do have their basketball, football, tennis and track teams, all of which are very good in their way, and I certainly would claim my part in them. But I would want more. Briefly, I would want shop privileges continuously from the day I enter till the day I leave. Once more I will say it, lest the point be missed, I would want such privileges not to make myself an expert mechanic, but to develop a certain deftness of hand, a keenness of eye for right lines, a sharpness of ear, in short, an alertness of the whole being which is invaluable in any calling in life, but surely to be acquired in no other way than by applying hand, eye, ear, the whole being, to actual tasks, and at no other time than in youth. Such practise would also afford recognition of true expertness in professionals; the quack would be known at sight, and his numbers would grow less; indifferent workmen would meet with quicker condemnation and so be led to better effort.

In shop work I include also laboratory practise in physics,

chemistry, biology, etc., which would naturally come in the later years of the course.

My eight years in the primary schools from the kindergarten through the seventh grade should have given me the ability to write a good "hand," to read any English at sight, a correct knowledge of the fundamentals of English composition and grammar, a fair knowledge of the physical and political geography of the world, the essentials of arithmetic, a fair notion of the structure of my own body and the functions of its several organs, the ability to draw in outline, and a knowledge of musical notation. Practise in drawing, penmanship, reading aloud, singing and marching to music would supply the physical development for these years, while the remaining subjects would strengthen the intellect.

Now, when I come to the church school at thirteen years of age I hope it is clear that I should want the development of the physical part of my being to continue along with my broadening intellect and unfolding spiritual nature, for my body is to be the machine whereby I am to get out of life a true living for my mind and for my soul. But where at the present time could I find a school under church control to fit my needs? The denominational preparatory schools and academies as now organized would fail in every instance so far as I know them to give me what I want. As now organized, the preparatory schools and colleges are too wasteful of time. There is too much repetition of work, many subjects are pursued to too great a length, and many others are of such a nature that the young man is a dullard indeed who cannot work them out for himself. Yet time for endless recitations in them all is taken.

To look at a modern college curriculum one would almost think that every student must be a second Bacon and claim all knowledge for his domain, but, unlike Bacon, he must have a "professor" to conduct him into every detail of his possessions, leaving nothing to be sought out for himself. I might submit to even that for the other advantages which would undoubtedly be mine in a church school, even at the expense of two or three extra years of valuable time, were it possible for me to

get there eventually what I want in the way of resourceful development and ready adaptability.

Oh, how criminal in the Church to have so long neglected this side of education! What folly in her to hold aloof in this matter further! I speak plainly and emphatically, for the chief purpose in writing this paper is to point out this very deficiency and to show forth to the Church her great opportunity in the educational field of the present times. Even if the sole aim of the church schools were to prepare young men by and by to enter the ministry, this side of their educational life cannot be neglected. But the church school has a broader field than that. She should give herself to the education of all youth from the ages of thirteen to nineteen, whether they be in the Church or out and whatever profession they may think to follow in after life, because of the vital importance of that spirit of reverence mentioned above, and because these are the years which determine what the man is to be. Will the Church awaken to her opportunity, her responsibility? Will she?

For the six years' academic course I should desire continuous practise in the correct use of English, both written and spoken, along with continuous exercise of hands and body, for these are to be means of expression no matter what my life work may be. For mental discipline and information in the rudiments of all human knowledge I should want something of all the subjects now offered in secondary schools and colleges, but I should want it presented in the most economical method possible, with encouragement to, and opportunity for, as much individual work as possible. As indicated before, two or three years at most of Latin and Greek studied mainly for etymological values will be quite sufficient. This supplemented by two years of German or French for the mental discipline which comes from the study of grammatical construction and translation, along with the continued drill in English, will give the maximum of benefit to come from linguistics. Further work in this line is mostly a waste of time. Two years of algebra and one each in geometry and trigonometry is enough of academic mathematics. Leave the analytic geometry, de-

scriptive geometry, calculus, quaternions, etc., for after years of university specialization. For the natural sciences a year each should be given to botany, zoölogy, geology, astronomy, chemistry and physics, but in all of them much time should be given to the laboratory, fully three-fourths of it. The subjects of philosophy, history, economics, sociology and literature should claim a due portion of the student's time for their informational and cultural values, but they should not be allowed to run out too much into detail. I should also ask that somewhere in the six years a thorough course in business forms, methods and commercial law be provided. In these days ignorance of accepted methods of keeping accounts is as reprehensible as bad spelling, and that is a poor school indeed which omits such instruction. The manual training courses in wood, metal and other materials should come in the earlier years of the course, and the laboratory work in biology, chemistry and physics in the later years, as suggested.

The student will be nineteen when this course is finished. By that time he will know what his calling or business in life is to be. Indeed it is likely he will have determined that matter several years before, and will have been directing to a great measure his efforts in the lines of his chosen profession.

For the sake of illustration we will suppose he purposes to enter the gospel ministry. He has yet two years before his majority is reached, and he goes immediately into the theological seminary for those two years. But the course is four years. Very well, that is none too long, and the young man has many things to learn, chief and most perplexing of all—his fellow man whom he purposes to serve in matters spiritual. At twenty-one he is to be self-supporting. Let him leave the seminary for two or three years and go to work to earn a living and a surplus to carry him through his remaining two years. Meanwhile he will gain a valuable experience, and, better still, he will gain somewhat in years. Through it all, however, he is to keep his ultimate purpose clear in mind, and every spare moment is to be devoted to the interests of that purpose, by way of reading, study, observation, cultivation of social qualities, charity work, Sunday-school work, etc.



What a blessing such a plan would be to the church ministry if adopted! No more grown men dependent on the Church as beneficiaries! Fewer tactless, inefficient, unbusiness like preachers! God hasten the day!

Or suppose the student is to become a physician. After leaving school at nineteen he should seek employment, as a teacher for a year or two, or in some office, pharmacy, chemist's shop, or other business connection which in four or five years would earn him enough to support him through a four-year medical course in some first-class medical college. In the meantime he is to give all his spare hours to reading and the further pursuit of biological and scientific studies. What he got in school should have been enough to put him on his feet in botany and zoology so that with the help of the excellent books now available he could make rapid and sure progress for himself. As a physician it is not well for him to enter active practise much before he is thirty, and it would be a great mistake for him to have some kind parent or wealthy uncle or other "angel" to keep him in school till that time. The same may be said for the engineer, law student and other prospective specialists.

The criticism may be offered that many would be tempted by this interim of business contact to fall by the way, and never return to the professional school for the completion of their course. So much the better! The professions would be well off without those who have not the mental strength and moral force of character to hold them to a high purpose in life. Indeed this weeding-out process would be most salutary. We would have fewer preachers, certainly, but how much more excellent would be the class left by the winnowing!

After such a six years academic course the student might well spend the remaining two years of his minority in a state university, normal school or agricultural college in pursuit of such studies as look more especially in the direction of his proposed profession. Many would be the advantages to follow from such a procedure if the parental funds readily permit. The state institutions are foremost in their equipment, and it is due to the young man that he should enjoy the best advan-

tages his circumstances will afford. While the presence of great numbers of fellow students would be a detriment in his earlier course before his character is well established, the reverse would be the case for the last two years of his minority, for the reason that then his judgment would be more mature and his self-reliance stronger, and the enthusiasm of the many would stimulate him to great personal endeavor.

I know there are many church people ready to censure whenever a word is said for the state educational institutions. But are not the children of the Church to be patriotic and stand for the institutions of the state whether they be educational, political or otherwise? If such institutions are not good, it is the duty of patriotic citizens to make them so. But if they are doing a good work, as they certainly are, is it not unpatriotic to disparage them?

As a rule the church schools should not attempt more than the six years work outlined above, for they seldom can have the equipment either in teaching force or appliances to give the student the best beyond that.

It may be objected that this plan will not give the graduated student a "degree," and he will hardly win that distinction (?) at the university if he should spend his two remaining years before his majority there. What of it? He misses nothing thereby. Beyond a mere empty sentiment, the value of the "B.A.," "B.L." or "B.S." is altogether *nil* in these days. But such a course will give him a value commensurate with the time and energy expended, whether it go tagged or untagged.

If those last two years be spent in an agricultural college, at his majority the young man can go on a farm and become a successful agriculturist as time goes on and experience accumulates. Or if they be spent in a normal school he can take up his profession as a teacher and become a success at that. Or he can go into business life and succeed there; or, as has been suggested, after he has laid by enough for his support during a purely professional course he can return to the professional school and fit himself to become a specialist.

This is the proposition of the new education, the education for these present times. Is it not reasonable? Is it not such

as every liberal-minded, right-thinking man can only second? We need not pray for its coming. It is at hand. Certain ones have tried to frighten it away by crying "mercenary!" "spirit of commercialism!" at it. But such are not the cries of the well-informed and the far-seeing.

It is the duty of every man to provide for his own support and that of all who may be dependent upon him. And furthermore, it is the duty of our schools to equip the youth of the land mentally and physically to provide that support, and at the same time to give them a culture to enjoy the life so assured. Logically, the most direct course to that end is the one to follow, and that is the very one which the education of the twentieth century model seeks to present.

---

## ARTICLE VI.

### SPECIALIZATION AND CONCENTRATION IN EDUCATION.

BY PROFESSOR J. W. RICHARD, D.D., LL.D.

That so many articles on education should appear in *THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY* at one time is not accidental, but symptomatic. It is an indication of the deep and widely felt interest in the subject among the educators of our General Synod. True, these articles were solicited, and in two cases at least the subjects were suggested. But the fact that all who were solicited to write, responded, and have written with so much earnestness and definiteness of aim, is evidence that their work is not perfunctory. They speak from the watch-towers of experience and observation. They know whereof they speak, and they speak as loyal sons of the Church.

As was to be expected, and as is not to be deplored, these writers do not view the educational problem exactly alike, nor do they follow the same method of attaining the end sought; but together they throw a flood of new light on the subject. They all indicate that many old things are passing away, and that many things are new, that we live in a new era, and that new demands are now made on the educational activity of the colleges, for it is in the interest of college education that they

write. The trend in all these writers is the same. Their faces, albeit not with the same angle, are turned toward the future. One of them has long been the honored professor of English in our oldest college; two are energetic college presidents, and one ably fills the chair of the natural sciences in our youngest college. What they have written ought to appeal very strongly to the Church, and to those who have in charge the direction of our institutions of learning.

While differing in their views of *minutiæ*, the consensus of judgment of these writers seems to be that our institutions are not fully meeting the needs of the times, nor fully the needs of their own proper constituency. Improvement is sought in strengthening the things that remain, in specialization, in more practical training. As an educator of twenty-nine years' experience—ten years in a college, and nineteen in a theological seminary—we give our hearty approval of the idea of advance, change, adaptation. As individuals and as a Church, we are realizing, and must come still more fully to realize, that the old curriculum does not furnish the only means of making men scholarly and cultured; that one line of intellectual work as well as another may train the mind and refine the manners; and hence that it can be no longer claimed that the Greek and Latin classics are the only *literæ humaniores*, nor justly be charged that a man cannot speak and write the English language accurately and effectively without classical training. The names of William Shakespeare, Andrew Fuller, Robert Burns, Hugh Miller, Abraham Lincoln, will stand forever as the complete refutation of that antiquated notion. On the contrary it has been found that the thorough grammatical, philological and literary study of the chief modern languages, at least when conducted on an elementary basis of Latin, furnishes mental training and refined culture, presents lofty ideals and equips with the ability to utilize the best thoughts of modern times, and especially of the living present.

Nor is it true that the ancients have stolen all our best thoughts and published our noblest sentiments. Daily there is something new under the sun. Let us not forget the past, but let us live in the present.

In a word the idea of encyclopedia in college training must be abandoned. It is impracticable, it is impossible. The encyclopedia is too vast. It cannot be compassed by any one person in a lifetime. Even the educated man of post-graduate and university training must be allowed, without a sense of self-disparagement, and without prejudice from others, to confess his ignorance of many subjects; and neither the Church, nor the State, nor Society should require that her educated men shall be encyclopedic scholars and walking libraries. But each of these factors in the world's grand march of progress has a right to demand that all professional men shall be thoroughly and fundamentally versed in those sciences which they affect to teach and to administer. Sciolism should be no longer tolerated. Too long has it been allowed to work evil.

The time for specialization has fully come. After a solid foundation shall have been laid in elementary training, specialization should be not only allowed, but even insisted on; albeit not such specialization as offers an easy and "practical" course, but such as provides full equivalents in *difficulty* and in *educational value*, such as requires from two to four years for mastery—a specialization by *groups*, not by individual subjects. System and symmetry should be kept well in view.

Were we called on to lay out an academic course for intending students of theology, we would "require" very much more Greek and Latin and German than are now "required" for graduation; but we would greatly curtail the encyclopedia of "required" studies that now spreads itself over so many pages of the college catalogue. Proficiency in the English language presupposed, we would require the prospective student of theology to learn the Greek, Latin and German languages so thoroughly as to be able to make a practical use of the vast treasures of theological literature in those languages, without having to resort to translations. In other words we would enhance the *special* preparation for the study of theology. We would bring our young men to our theological seminaries with a better preparation for theological study than we ourselves had. We would have them prepared to do original and independent research. We would make them scholarly as well as

practical dividers of the word of truth, for the time is here when only the scholarly minister can sustain himself in many communities, and can command the respect of those intelligent and cultured people who are now found in so many congregations and communities. Not less piety, but more scholarship is needed in the pulpit. The pew will not bow the knee to platitudes and common-places and airy nothings. The preacher must put thought in his sermon, as well as have the Spirit in it. Only theologians can be great preachers; only theologians have been great preachers—Paul, Augustine, Bernard, Luther, Calvin, Wesley, Edwards, Tholuck, Gore.

And more: We would carry specialization into the theological seminary. After a curriculum of "required" studies as a basis, we would offer groups of electives which are both theoretical and practical. Men should be allowed to follow tastes, and to develop special talents, for "there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit," and the diverse gifts of men, developed and strengthened by special training, can all be made serviceable in the one Kingdom of the Master, which, as it is daily presenting new conditions, consequently requires new adaptation for service.

Too true is it, alas! that the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light.

Were we called on to mark out a course of preparatory training for intending students of law, of medicine, of the natural sciences, we would certainly begin very early on lines that would have in view the exigencies of the profession, the literature of the subject and the work to be done.

The Susquehanna river is very picturesque, but the deeper Hudson is more effective.

In fine, we commit ourself to specialization, but not to a specialization that lowers the standard of scholarship, or makes it easy for the student, or provides short-cuts, or fails of ideals; but to a specialization that gives men large intellectual and ethical culture, that draws out the best talents in them, and makes them masters in their own spheres of activity. We would intensify scholarship by making it deeper. "Beware of

the man of one book; beware of the man who knows one thing well."

*Longe fuge; fenum habet in cornu.*

But how is specialization to be realized? Aye, there's the rub. Under conditions existing among us specialization such as we have indicated, is not possible, either in college or in the theological seminary. Professors have quite enough to do with the "required" courses and with the few electives now offered. To demand more at their hands is to diminish their efficiency, and to reduce them to the category of the country schoolmaster, who holds the text-book in his hand and "hears a recitation." The only effective way to meet the new needs, and to place our educational work on a commanding plane, and to render it equal to the demands of the times, is to increase the teaching force in our institutions. But this should be done, not by scaling down the salaries of professors, but by enlarging the endowments. The crisis is upon us. The Church must advance the money, or hang on the fagend of the educational procession. The Million Dollars movement, if successful, will help. But what is a million dollars among so many institutions? Five colleges and one seminary aspiring to the dignity of a college, two theological seminaries, and three theological departments, with a constituency of less than 220,000 members!

What then is our prime need? One word answers the question: *Concentration*. Business men are beginning to inquire, "What will your million dollars accomplish, if you are going to divide it among so many?" Concentration, then, should be calmly considered. Can we not strengthen our educational work by reducing the number of our institutions? Who will bring the matter squarely before the next convention of the General Synod, and ask for the appointment of a committee to consider the advisability and the feasibility of concentration? Who? There are precedents. In 1815 the University of Wittenberg was united with the University of Halle. In 1853 the Reformed Church in Pennsylvania concentrated its educational work at Lancaster, and made one institution out of two. Some forty years ago the Methodists abandoned two colleges in



Northern Illinois and concentrated at Evanston; and about the same time union was effected between Jefferson College and Washington College in Pennsylvania.

There is no doubt that in each case much tender sentiment was sacrificed, and that financial loss was sustained. But in each case new sentiment has been created, and vast has been the educational gain. With us the issue must not be tender sentiment and financial loss, but the vast gain that will inevitably follow, in enlarged faculties, in improved curricula, in educational standing, in work done. Shall we concentrate? It is not wise to inquire, "Shall A go to B, or shall B come to A; or shall A and B move to a point called C." The one serious, solemn question should be, "Shall we concentrate?" We believe the wise heads of the Church are ready to say: *Let us concentrate*, and we believe the business intelligence of the people is ready to second the motion.

Let us learn wisdom from the children of this world. Let us make such friendly combinations as will enable us to build up a few institutions that shall command the fuller support of our own people, that shall more effectively meet the needs of the Church, that shall make us seen and known in the educational world. Every day that we abide in our present condition we suffer detriment. Local interests and personal preferences and tender sentiment must yield to the common weal. *Concentration!!* The wise heads of the Church will say: It is desirable; the practical heads will say: It is feasible. *Then let us have it.*

## ARTICLE VII.

## THE ATONEMENT.

BY SAMUEL SCHWARM, Ph.D., D.D.

The primary signification of the word *atonement*, which was probably derived from "at-one-ment," was reconciliation, but it is now generally used in the sense of expiation, satisfaction made for an offense, propitiation of wrath, price paid for redemption or ransom. It is commonly used to express "the expiation of sin and the propitiation of God by the incarnation, life, sufferings and death of the Lord Jesus Christ."

In the Old Testament of our English Bible the word atonement is generally found as the translation of the Hebrew verb *Kaphar*, which means to cover, to cover with sacrificial blood, to expiate, to purge away sin, to blot sin out, to ransom, to reconcile. In the Greek New Testament the same great fundamental idea is expressed by a number of words, which have been variously translated; for example, *Katallage* by atonement or, its equivalent, reconciliation; *hilasmos* by propitiation; *lutrosis* by redemption; *hilaskesthai* by expiation; *agorazein* and *lutron* by ransom, etc.

In the New Testament, as also in the Old, the use of the word atonement, or any of its equivalents, implies an estrangement between God and man, an alienation between these two parties, caused by sin. Sin has separated them, opened a chasm between them. On man's part this alienation is the direct consequence of his willful disobedience to God's righteous law. On God's part it follows from the very nature of his perfect holiness and love. Just because he is holy and loving he cannot be indifferent to the transgression of his holy law. God's condemnation must rest upon the transgressor until he make an atonement, or satisfaction, for his disobedience, that is acceptable.

The Atonement is therefore the scheme by which these alienated parties, God and man, are brought together again, re-

conciled, made fast friends instead of enemies, fitted to live together and enjoy each other for eternity. The story of how this perfect satisfaction has been made thro the life, suffering and death of Christ Jesus, God's only begotten and well beloved Son, for the sinner, is an old, but, nevertheless, an exceedingly important one. It needs to be constantly retold and impressed anew upon the minds and hearts of sinners. It has been, I fear, too much neglected in recent years. The life and existence of the Christian Church is involved with it. There cannot possibly be any Christian church, if this doctrine of the Atonement ceases to be preached and believed.

#### I. THE NECESSITY FOR AN ATONEMENT.

The whole law of God for the government of mankind was summed up by Moses, and also by Jesus Christ in this, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength." And by the Apostle Paul in one word, namely, "Love." It was said, "He that doeth these things shall live thereby." "Do this and thou shalt live." "But cursed is every one who continueth not in all things written in the law to do them." The law that God gave man for his government was simply the law of love which was to manifest itself in obedience. Obedience was life, disobedience, death. As a test of love, or obedience, God said to the first head of the human race: "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat, for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." But this just and righteous requirement of the being who had received his life and all from God, and who could have easily granted what God asked of him, was violated by willful disobedience. Thro this disobedience the first human pair alienated themselves from God, they lost the image of God in which they had been created, and they were transformed into the image of sin. They now hid themselves in the garden to avoid meeting God, in whom they had hitherto delighted. And all their children, who have been naturally engendered, have followed their example of disobedience and hiding from God. "They have all

gone astray. They are altogether become filthy, there is none that doeth good, no not even so much as one." The carnal mind has become enmity against God thro sin; it is not reconciled to the law of God, neither can it be. And we are also told that God is angry with the wicked every day, that he cannot look upon sin with any degree of allowance.

It is indeed true that God did not cease to love man, for He is love and cannot cease to love, but it is also true that He is just and righteous and could not, consequently, continue to treat the sinner as tho he were holy. He must now treat him as a disobedient and rebellious subject. He must look upon him as one who justly merited his condemnation because of his transgressions, as one whom he could no longer treat as innocent until he had made amends for his disobedience. A just and righteous human father, even, cannot treat a wayward and rebellious child, tho he love him ever so much, as he can one who is innocent and obedient. He realizes that it is due to his character and position that the disobedient and rebellious child should make satisfaction for his disobedience and rebellion and be submissive before he can again treat him as innocent.

So this disobedience on the part of man produced a changed relationship between God and man. It separated two who were formerly one. And this separation concerned God as well as man. He was the *justly* offended one. He was the one whose holy law had been violated, who was treated as tho he were an unholy and unrighteous being, as tho he were a liar. He could not, therefore, forgive the sinner, unless he make complete satisfaction for the injured justice, but must mete upon him the threatened penalty attached to the law. Hence death passed upon all men, for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God.

The sinner, then, in order to be justly pardoned, must render a full and perfect satisfaction, in the eyes of the lawgiver and also in the eyes of all of his innocent and obedient subjects, for the violated law, a satisfaction that will place the character and law of God in such a condition that they will not be dishonored or weakened by the pardoning of the sin-

ner. The motives to obedience must not be weakened, nor the respect for God's character. The character of God must be made to appear perfectly consistent to all his creatures, no less opposed to sin nor less delighted in holiness than if the law had never been violated. There must be a perfect healing of the law, the justly offended deity must be completely propiated. For God to pardon the sinner without such a complete and perfect satisfaction for disobedience would have manifested folly in giving a law which he foresaw should not be enforced; or else weakness, in not being able to enforce it; or injustice, in treating the violator as tho he had obeyed the law; or untruthfulness, in proclaiming he would enforce the law and then fail to do so.

For such a ruler, the pardoned sinner, even, could have but little, if any, respect. And his name would be despised and abhorred by all holy and righteous beings. Such a ruler the God of the Bible is not. He will in no wise clear the guilty without perfect satisfaction. This is not merely the teaching of his Word, but it is the ineffaceable law of our consciences. The law, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die," was revealed from heaven and also written on the hearts of men. This law demands satisfaction or death. It is inexorable. It knows no mercy, has no pity. "The wages of sin is death." "Sin when it is finished bringeth forth death."

#### A MERE PROCLAMATION OF PARDON NOT SUFFICIENT.

A mere proclamation of forgiveness without the actual removal of sin would have been only an apparent, a seeming reconciliation; and sooner must God leave the whole world to sink in ruin than violate the eternal laws of his holiness and rectitude. Holy love, which possesses the right of unconditional demand upon the human heart, must manifest itself to the conscience as a creditor who cannot be refused, who continues to knock until his demands are satisfied. The debt must be paid. Even if a man could have induced God to proclaim an unconditional pardon, he could not thus have been reconciled to God so long as he remains constituted as at pres-

ent; for his conscience emphatically tells him that the debt must be paid and the guilt removed before he can even convince himself that God is reconciled. Man's reason and conscience recognize the truth that satisfaction from the sinner is due to God and his government. (Martensen).

And, on the other hand, a change must also be brought about in the disposition of the sinner. He must be made holy again before he can be reconciled to God and restored to his former relation to him. He must be so changed also that he will regard God as holy and just, and himself as having been rightly condemned to death for his transgressions. God must be brought to be to him still a God of love and as infinitely worthy of his love, and not to be a tyrant deserving of hatred. To bring about, therefore, right relations again between God and man, both must be reconciled, that is God's injured justice must be satisfied and man's sin and sinful disposition removed, so the atonement must have an ethical as well as redemptive power. Without such an atonement, at-one-ment, no sinner could possibly be pardoned and saved.

The necessity for an atonement was not absolute, but conditional. God was not obliged to save the sinner. He might justly have let him die the death. But if man was to be saved there must be a perfect satisfaction made first.

## II. WHERE WAS SUCH AN ATONEMENT, OR SATISFACTION, TO BE FOUND?

The transgressor could no more render the required satisfaction for himself than a guilty criminal can give himself pardon and a good character. And one man could not render this satisfaction for his fellow man, for all are sinners and alike under condemnation; and even if all had not sinned, no one man can possibly do more than the law requires him to do for himself. No man can obey the laws of his country, even, for himself and also for another. Every man must render perfect obedience to the law for himself, and that is all he can do; and he can merit nothing for that, for it is his duty, or due.

Nor yet could the transgressor make the required satisfac-

tion for his sins by offering the life of some animal instead of his own. A dumb beast cannot be a sufficient substitute before a just judge for a rational being. It is true the Israelites were commanded to offer animal sacrifices for sin, but they were not proclaimed as self-sufficient, but as typical of an Infinite Sacrifice to be made for sinful men by a Mighty Deliverer whom God promised to send. There was none other than a typical value in those animal sacrifices. They pointed forward to the great and all-sufficient sacrifice that God would provide for the sinner. It was thro faith in this promised Redeemer, in the redemption to be made by his perfect sacrifice, that the Israelite was reconciled to God and given admittance to the heavenly Canaan and not thro the virtue of the blood of a beast.

"Not all the blood of beasts,  
On Jewish altars slain,  
Could give the guilty conscience peace  
Or wipe away a stain."

Neither could an angel offer himself for the sins of mankind, for the angels were all also subject to the same law, and could do no more than satisfy its claims for themselves. No one who owes every duty he can possibly render can pay a debt for another. Where then could man find this required satisfaction that was absolutely necessary to his salvation? Who or what could stand in the place of the sinner and obey the law and pay its penalty for him? No man could, no animal could, no angel, even, could. Well might the sinner exclaim, "O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" So far as the sinner was concerned, unaided by divine Revelation, there was no answer for this question.

"Plunged in a gulf of dark despair,  
We wretched sinners lay,  
Without one cheerful gleam of hope  
Or spark of glimmering day."

Anselm, who was the first to give a scientific statement of



the doctrine of the Atonement, which has generally been accepted as essentially correct by the Church, reasoned as follows: "Sin is a debt. Our Lord so called it in his prayer. Man owed complete submission to God, perfect obedience. This he did not render to him. Hence his debt. Renewed submission will not pay this debt and remove his guilt. Man to become free must first make perfect satisfaction for past sin and must then render a sinless obedience for the future. This he is unable to do. But his inability does not free him from his obligations, for it is the result of his free act.

"But cannot the love of God step in here and forgive the sinner without any satisfaction at all? No, for that would be putting a premium on unrighteousness, or transgression of law. It would destroy the character of God for justice and truth.

"Cannot man then render satisfaction for violated justice? Only by his eternal punishment and death. Hence one man cannot become the savior of another, for all are sinners and all must die.

"But cannot satisfaction be made for man by some substitute of some kind? That all depends upon the nature and character of the substitute. Justice would be defrauded by a substitute of a less value for that of a greater. The satisfaction for the sins of mankind must be an infinite satisfaction, for an infinitely holy and wise law, of an infinitely holy and wise being, was violated. God alone can make such a satisfaction."

The provision for making this atonement, even under the Old Testament dispensation, was by divine appointment, as already intimated in the promised Deliverer, and was by no means a mere human device for overcoming God's reluctance to forgive disobedience. Under the cover of the blood of a victim slain by his own hand in acknowledgement of the righteousness of God's condemnation of disobedience, brought by consecrated hands into direct contact with the symbols of God's presence, the worshipper, in spite of his defilement, might himself draw near to God. So the story of the Atonement, or perfect satisfaction for sin, which in the Gospel, is the provision of God himself, thro his infinite wisdom and love.

It was the unchanging and everlasting love of God that devised the scheme by which he could forgive the believing sinner and still be just. This scheme is in perfect harmony, therefore, with God's law, for God's love is not an illicit love, that shuts its eyes to the requirements of righteousness and justice, but a love that meets every claim of a holy law, every requirement of a perfect atonement was fulfilled in Jesus Christ, as the following passages declare: For what the law could not do, in that it was weak thro the flesh (sinful man), God sending his own Son in the *likeness of sinful flesh*, and for sin (by a sacrifice for sin) condemned sin in the flesh: That the righteousness or requirements of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. (Rom. 8 : 3, 4.) "For when we were yet without strength in due time Christ died for the ungodly." "God commends his own love to us, in that, while still being sinners Christ died for us." "Much more, therefore, having been justified now through his blood, we shall be saved by him from wrath. For if, being enemies, we were reconciled to God thro the death of his Son, much more, having been reconciled we shall be saved by his life. And not only so, but also we boast in God thro our Lord Jesus Christ thro whom we have now received the reconciliation." "For as by the disobedience of the one man the many were constituted sinners, so also by the obedience of the one many shall be constituted righteous." (Rom. 5 : 6-20). "But now apart from the law the righteousness of God has been manifested, being borne witness to by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God thro faith of Jesus Christ, towards all and upon all those that believe, for there is no distinction; for all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace thro the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God set forth to be a propitiation (mercy seat), thro faith, by his blood, to show his righteousness, because of the passing by of sins done afore-time, in the forbearance of God; for the shewing, he might himself be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus" (Rom. 3 : 21-26). "For there is one God, one mediator also between God and men, himself man, Christ

Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all (1 Tim. 2 : 5, 6)." "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many (Matt. 20 : 28)." "He was delivered for our offenses, and raised again for our justification (Ro. 4 : 25)." "Christ, our Passover, is sacrificed for us (1 Cor. 15 : 7)." These passages, and many more like them in the New Testament, mean, if they mean anything, that God made Jesus Christ man's substitute, and thro him all the demands of the law upon the sinner were met and paid. The same was also foreshadowed by the law and the prophets, especially in Isaiah fifty-three : "The Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all"—"the chastisement of our peace was upon him—with his stripes we are healed," etc. Christ's whole life was a perfect self-surrender to the loving service of his brethren in trustful obedience to his Father's will. Its culmination was the shedding of his blood freely for us, so that we might be saved by his blood.

With these Scriptures harmonize, where rightly interpreted, the teachings of the Church Fathers, tho they have left us no extended treatises on this subject. Polycarp, a pupil of John, says, "Christ is our Saviour, for thro grace we are righteous, not by works ; for our sins, he has even taken death upon himself, he bore our sins in his own holy body on the tree." Barnabas, a pupil of Paul, says, "The Lord endured to deliver his body to death, that we might be sanctified by the remission of sins which is by the shedding of the blood." Justin, the Martyr, says, "God, himself, gave up his Son for us, the holy for the unholy, the good for the evil. For what else could cover our sins, but his righteousness? Oh, wonderful operation ! that the sinfulness of the many should be hidden in the one, and that the righteousness of the one should justify the many ungodly."

Athanasius said, "Christ took our sufferings upon himself and presented them to the Father, entreating for us that they be satisfied in him."

Augustin said, "All men are separated from God by sin. Hence they can be reconciled with him only thro the remission

of sin, and this only thro the grace of a most merciful Saviour, and this grace thro the one only victim of the most true and only perfect priest."

The Reformers followed the teachings of these Church Fathers, and especially of Anselm, on this great subject. They merely added that this atonement must be appropriated by the sinner for himself thro faith in Jesus Christ, the atoning sacrifice; and also that by his perfect obedience to the law Christ procured for the believing sinner eternal felicity.

And with this teaching the hymnology of the Church harmonizes also, from the first Christian hymn:—

"Thou art one holy Lord,  
The all-subduing Word,  
The healer of strife!  
Thou didst thyself abase  
That from sin's deep disgrace  
Thou mightest save our race,  
And give us life," to Doderidge's:—

"Behold the amazing sight,  
The Saviour lifted high!  
Behold the Son of God's delight  
Expire in agony!

For whom, for whom, my heart,  
Were all these agonies borne?  
Why did he feel that piercing smart,  
And meet the various scorn?

"For love of us he bled!  
And all in torture died  
'Twas love that bowed his fainting head,  
And o'pd his gushing side."

#### WHY CHRIST COULD MAKE THIS SACRIFICE.

But how was it possible for Christ to make such a full and perfect satisfaction for the violated law? It was all owing to the fact that he was the God-man, perfect God and perfect man. This is plainly taught by the Sacred Scriptures in that they ascribed to him divine attributes, divine works, divine worship and divine names. And they also ascribe to him human attributes, human works, human needs and names. His work is

really, therefore, God's work of love and grace towards the race; and it is, also, really in the highest sense the act of humanity; for it is God in human nature, who satisfies the demands of righteousness. The Christ is not only God, but also the Second Adam taking the place of humanity and offering in himself a sacrifice which must be regarded as the actual work of humanity itself. He fulfilled the law not as a single casual individual in the course of a generation, but as the head of the race under whom all must be included. The righteousness of the whole Body is, therefore, included in him as the head, and as the Father beholds the race in him, he beholds the race as one in whom he is well pleased. And to those who receive him he gives power to become the Sons of God. (Martensen).

And thus Anselm also: "God alone can make such an infinite satisfaction. But on the other hand it must be rendered by man, or else it will not be a satisfaction for man's sins. Hence it must be rendered by a God-man. But no suffering or sacrifice was due from this God-man, hence his obedience and satisfaction was a surplusage and might inure to sinful man."

### III. THE ATONEMENT, OR SATISFACTION, MADE BY CHRIST WAS A REAL AND SUFFICIENT ONE.

Abelard maintained, that God on the repentance of the sinner can forgive him without any satisfaction whatever; that the death of Christ was, therefore, not a real satisfaction for sin, but an exhibition of God's love in order to move sinners to repentance. This idea has had its adherents from the days of Abelard down to our times. But it is manifestly in opposition to the Scriptures, both of the Old and of the New Testament, as we have seen:—"The Lord laid upon him the iniquity of us all;" "The chastisement of our peace was upon him" (Is. 53); "He was delivered for our offenses" (Rom. 4: 25); "God sending his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and as a sacrifice for sin, condemned sin in the flesh" (Rom. 8: 3, 4).

Grotius, an eminent jurist, claimed that the death of Christ was not an equivalent for the punishment of the sinner, but it was accepted as such by God. God's law did not proceed from,

nor was it a part of, his nature, but it was an act of his will, and hence might be revoked, or the penalty remitted, if he saw fit. But he could not remit the penalty entirely in the case of the violator, for it would have had an injurious effect upon the obedience of his creatures in general. Hence there must be some demonstration made against sin.

But even if the law was not a part of God's nature, but merely an act of his will, he nevertheless willed to enact it and demand perfect compliance with it, on penalty of death, and make his threatening against its transgression absolute. His truthfulness was involved therefore. How could God truthfully pardon the sinner unless he could in some way show that he had satisfied the whole demand of the law and was no transgressor? And if God could forgive a part of man's sins without satisfaction, why not all? Would not a partial forgiveness also have had a bad influence upon the obedience of his creatures in general?

The sacrifice which Christ made was not spectacular, but was a real purchasing of salvation for all men, to be offered to them on conditions made known in the Gospels. It was not merely an example of self-sacrifice, but a real satisfaction that the sinner may appropriate thro faith, and thus be reconciled with God and made an heir of eternal life, but without which he cannot see God. Christ made a real satisfaction for all sin, both original and actual, and that not merely for an elect portion, but for every man. God, therefore, no longer demands of the sinner that he make satisfaction for his own sins, but merely that he repent of them and accept and plead the satisfaction that has been made thro Christ Jesus. It is not necessary to quote many passages of Scripture to prove this, for it is fully proven by the Scripture passages already quoted. We are told, "The blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin;" "He gave his life a ransom for all;" "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world." Cyril, of Jerusalem, said, "Christ who died for us was no insignificant creature, he was no mere animal victim, he was no mere man, he was not an angel, but was God incarnate. The iniquity of

us sinners was not so great as the righteousness of him who died for us, the sins we have committed are not equal to the atonement made by him who laid down his life for us." If Christ did not make a real and sufficient atonement for all, then the Gospel cannot be good tidings for all.

But on the other hand, the fact that he made such an atonement for all does not imply that all will be saved. It merely signifies that all may be saved. The satisfaction that Christ has made for sin is not a payment, unconditionally, of the debt that sinners owe. It is nowhere so represented in the Scriptures. The Scriptures say, "He that believeth shall be saved." "He that believeth shall not be damned." The application of the merits of Christ's sacrifice of himself for the sins of the world depends in the case of any sinner upon his acceptance of it thro faith. Christ has made it possible for God to justify the believing sinner and still be just. But the unbelieving sinner can have no part or lot in the blessed atonement of Christ Jesus; for as God could not justly pardon the sinner without an atonement, neither can he now, since an atonement has been made, unless the sinner will accept and plead that atonement for himself. The proclamation of salvation is, "Repent and believe the Gospel." "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." "The Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst, come; and whosoever will let him take the water of life freely." The Atonement is world-wide, but the acceptance has hitherto been limited. But "God is in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation." Therefore, we are commissioned to say unto all men, "Be ye reconciled to God." Redemption is not complete without reconciliation. Christ hath redeemed the world from the curse of the law, and God is now in Christ reconciling the world unto himself.



## IV. TO WHOM, OR FOR WHAT, WAS THE SATISFACTION MADE?

This has, probably, already been sufficiently stated. But on this point some of the church fathers of the third and fourth centuries seem to have been somewhat in error. Some of them used language which would imply that in their understanding Christ gave himself as a ransom for man to Satan. But the Scriptures nowhere teach that Christ was given to Satan as a ransom. Satan had no just claim on the sinner. His was merely the right of the seducer, the robber. We cannot entertain the idea that a just God would recognize such a right and pay such an infinite price to satisfy it.

There are others who suppose the Church teaches that Christ give himself as a ransom to God, the Father, for the sinner, to appease the Father's wrath against the sinner and to induce him to forgive the sinner and let him go free. There are some, so-called, religious teachers in our day who declaim vehemently against such a horrible doctrine. They say they could not worship such a bloody and wrathful God as that. But the true Christian Church has never drawn such a doctrine from the Word of God, nor taught it. And then there are still others who are horrified at the very idea of a blood atonement at all. They strenuously declare that the cross of Christ no longer stands for a blood atonement, that it is merely a symbol of the perfect obedience and self-surrender to God on the part of his Son, which is an example to be followed by all of his intelligent creatures.

Gregory Naziarzen, thinking along these lines, wrote: "We are under the dominion of the wicked one, inasmuch as we were sold under sin, and exchanged pleasure for vileness. If it now be true that a ransom is always paid to him who is in possession of the thing for which it is due, I would ask, to whom was it paid in this case? And for what reason? Perhaps to Satan himself? But it would be a burning shame to think so; for in that case the robber had not only received from God, but God himself as a ransom and reward for his tyranny. Or is it paid to the Father himself? How could it

be, for God does not hold us in bondage. And how can it be said that the Father delighteth in the blood of his Son?"

The Scriptures certainly teach that God is justly angry with the sinner (Ps. 7 : 11); but they nowhere ever intimate that he was so inordinately angry at him that it required the death of his Son to appease his anger. They plainly declare the love of God for the sinner even before Christ died for him, namely, "God so loved the world that he gave his Son (John 3 : 16)," and "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins (1 John 4 : 10)." The sacrifice made by Christ in dying was necessary to maintain the justice and truthfulness of God and to reestablish right relations between him and man, as has already been stated. It was to satisfy justice, so that God could be just and yet be the justifier of the sinner, and to place the sinner in a state of grace where he could, by God's help, accept the pardon of his sins and become a new creature. God was just as well as good. It was not a fanciful claim of Satan, nor an unholiness of wrath that made it impossible to pardon the sinner without the satisfaction rendered by Christ. Such opinions do the holy character of God great injustice. They are really blasphemous.

God had expressed his character and will in his holy law. This law had an absolute penalty affixed. It had been willfully violated. God could not, therefore, pardon the transgressor. He must mete out the penalty upon the sinner or upon a substitute who could properly take his place, or else be unjust and false. He might love and pity the sinner, but he was in duty bound to enforce his law, if he was to remain just and maintain his justice and holiness. It was certainly better that a world should perish than that God should destroy his character. A human judge, even, dare not pardon a criminal simply because he loves and pities him. He must maintain the righteousness of the law even at the expense of his feelings, or else be despised by all good and just people. So God could not have forgiven the sinner without perfect satisfaction and have remained God. Judged according to a holy standard, and by a holy judge, there was absolutely no escape therefore for the

sinner in so far as he was concerned. But he most unexpectedly found grace and mercy to help him in his time of need. God, though justly angry with the sinner, nevertheless sent his Son in the flesh to obey the law for sinful man and to show that it was just and right, and to suffer its penalty in his own person, though entirely innocent, in order that he might satisfy its claim on the sinner, so that God might be just and the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus. "For he made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him (2 Cor. 5 : 12)." (See also Rom. 8 : 3.)

How Christ could stand in the place of the sinner, the holy for the unholy, and suffer the law for him, I do not even pretend to be able to fathom. It is one of the inscrutable mysteries of infinite wisdom and justice. But this same law of the sacrifice of one life for another appears to run all through God's providential government. Certainly an infinitely wise and holy law-giver is the best judge as to what constitutes a perfect satisfaction for his violated law. And God has proclaimed a full and free pardon for every one who believeth in Jesus. This is enough for me. I gladly take Jesus as my substitute, and plead his merits before a throne of grace.

Who can justly accuse God of disregard for his holy law; and of a lack of love for the sinner, when he permits the penalty for his violation to be meted out upon his well beloved Son, infinitely innocent and holy, though willingly taking the sinner's place? And who, having violated God's law, will dare despise the suffering of Christ for him and hope to escape? In Christ, and in Christ only, can the sinner satisfy the claims of divine justice upon him. Paul asks, "Do we by faith make void the law? God forbid! Nay, by faith we establish the law (Rom. 3 : 31)." "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is ever at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercessions for us (Rom. 8 : 31, 32)."

The scheme of salvation, by making a perfect salvation for

the violated law, is the most fitting and glorious because it maintains the justice and honor of God's character and makes the greatest possible display of his love. (See Bonaventura). It has been said, It would have been more fitting to God to have pardoned the sinner unconditionally than to have required such a bloody sacrifice. The fitness of anything is based upon its necessity. The laws of human governments justify taking the life of a man if it is necessary to maintain the majesty of the State, or even to save one's own life. It was absolutely necessary for God to maintain His character for justice, "for justice and judgment are the habitation of His throne," but it was not absolutely necessary that He pardon the sinner, for by his sin he had forfeited all claim to mercy. And most assuredly it cannot be maintained that the sinner had such a claim upon God's mercy as to compel him to pardon at the expense of his character.

And it most certainly cannot be proven that the pardon of the sinner without any satisfaction to divine justice and character would have been a greater display of divine love than his salvation at such priceless sacrifice. There can be no greater display of love than to suffer loss and pain and death for another. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man should lay down his life for his friend. But while we were yet sinners Christ died for us (Rom. 5 : 8)." But Christ did not die for us sinners before "God so loved the world that he gave his only Son" to die for us (John 3 : 16). The love of the Father and of the Son were not two loves, but one and the same love. In this, as in all other things, the Father and the Son are one. The same may also be said of Christ and the Holy Spirit, for the Spirit also has a part in the work of redemption. Out of love, pure and holy love, the holy Trinity undertook the blessed work of redemption and reconciliation. What greater display of love could there, therefore, possibly be than that displayed by the Cross of Christ?

"In the Cross of Christ I glory,  
Tow'ring o'er the wrecks of time;  
All the light of sacred story  
Gathers round its head sublime.

When the woes of life o'ertake me,  
Hopes deceive and fears annoy,  
Never shall the cross forsake me :  
Lo ! it glows with peace and joy."

---

## ARTICLE VIII.

## ST. PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF PREACHING.

BY C. F. SANDERS, A.M., B.D.

The Apostle Paul appears as a factor in history at a time when a few obscure men are beginning the greatest conquest of all time. The goal of their endeavor is the complete Kingdom of God "wherein dwelleth righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." Their method is extraordinary in its simplicity as well as in its power. They go about the accomplishment of their task by preaching the good news of salvation in the name of Jesus Christ. Some time after his conversion, marvelously consummated, Paul associates himself in the Apostolic task of the Disciples and soon becomes the leading exponent of the "new way." Prominent in all his addresses and epistles is the conception that the one only hope of the world lies in having the gospel preached to men. This is not with him a mere preceptive doctrine. It is emphatically taught by the example of his energetic life.

The real strength of this conception appears to best advantage at the close of his second European mission. He has had experience then. His preaching has borne fruit. He has made converts. But he has aroused antagonism. The Jews repudiate him and he turns to the Gentiles. But lo, in Ephesus the Gentiles drive him out. He has just despatched his first Epistle to Corinth, at the beginning of which he emphasizes his conviction that through "the foolishness of the preaching" God had ordained to save "them that believe." Now that neither Jew nor Gentile is willing to hear him in Asia he has opportunity to reflect. Humanly speaking this was a dark

hour in the Apostle's life. The seeming aspects of failure were pressing hard on every hand. Such experiences were calculated to make brave men lose heart. But instead of a single desponding note there flashes forth the bold determination of a change of policy; a change characteristic of one who is confident of his cause, and bold enough to execute the most daring plans for its success. With the keen foresight of superior statesmanship Paul sees he must justify his cause in the Imperial City before any great success can be attained in the provinces. He goes over to Corinth and under the friendly roof of the Consul Gaius he writes the Roman Epistle. Despite past experiences he is ready to preach the Gospel to them "that are at Rome also." "For I am not ashamed of the Gospel; for it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth, to the Jew first and also to the Greek." Apparently thwarted at the outposts, he decides to march upon the citadel. Though he dared preach no longer in Asia, he would come to royal Rome to preach this gospel, the hope of the world. The emphasis thus placed upon the importance of preaching the Gospel is the strongest possible. No matter what were the seeming results to the contrary the Gospel must be preached. Ruin is universal and preaching is the way the only remedy can reach the human heart. "We reckon therefore that a man is justified by faith." "Faith cometh by hearing; and hearing by the Word of God." "But how can they hear without a preacher?"

The depth of this conviction is more fully unfolded when we note the exceeding contrast which it presents. Rome stood for power. Never has any city been in every outward sense so thoroughly imperial. "Lauded by poets and orators as 'queen of cities,' 'home of the gods,' 'golden Rome,' 'the epitome of the world,'" Rome was at this period the rendezvous of every fraud and every truth of which the world had knowledge. Religionists of every variety had erected shrines within the precincts of the eternal city. It was also the city of philosophers. Cato, Cicero and Seneca had been her teachers. Of the natural forces for human amelioration there was an abun-

ance. Paganism, Judaism, philosophy and statecraft each had done its part, and yet a modern historian says of that time: "Rome resembles a field during a pestilence which contains nothing but corpses and ravens which are devouring them." (Friedlaender). To this corrupt metropolis, where every natural resource had failed, he would come with a supernatural power efficient for salvation to all; "the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth." The proposition is glorious. The two strong arms, philosophic ethics and military power, so splendid in appearance, the logical weapons of state defense, were proven inadequate. He proposes to do what they attempted, but failed, by preaching.

Paul's distinction consists in his adequate comprehension of the philosophy of redemption. He knows that sin has completely ruined man. Every method which fails to reckon with this primary fact is false at its foundation and cannot stand. To bring forth from this ruin a new man clothed upon with righteousness is a task for which God alone is capable. He has laid hold upon the revealed fact that God will do this effectually through His Word. The Roman Epistle, called the "*absolutissima epitome evangelii*" by Luther, the "*Doctrinae Christianae compendium*" by Melancthon, is the completest expression of the method of the world's redemption in the literature of the whole world. It contains the secret of Paul's confidence as well as his success. A recent scholar has said: "Luther found the Gospel in Romans, and found it in a power which made him the greatest conductor of spiritual force since Paul, which directly regenerated one-half of Christendom and indirectly did much to reform the other half." (Denny). This, because in it he found Paul's secret and caught his inspiration.

The essential importance of preaching is defined by the relation in which it stands to the work to be performed. The vital problem to every human heart ever since the flaming sword and cherubim closed the gates of Paradise against fallen man has been that of salvation. At the center of the human heart struggle is the question; "How shall sinful man be righteous before God?" O Jehovah, thou who art of purer eyes than to



behold iniquity, who canst not look with pleasure upon sin, if thou dost require justice, who can stand before thee? Transpose this question how you will, its substance underlies every form of religion from the crudest animism to the profoundest spiritualism, expressing the universal longing of mankind to get back to Paradise. Substitute abstract titles for personal names here and you have rationalism giving expression to the identical yearning of the soul. Paul's proposition is the solution; "Christ is the end of the law unto righteousness to every one that believeth." By faith ye shall appear clothed with a divine righteousness.

This bold proposition had a strange sound to the ears of the Roman world. It sounds strange still to unregenerate man, for "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually judged." To speak of atonement in the blood of the Son of God to man unregenerate is to speak in an unknown tongue. To tell of a new birth by which sinful man is dead unto sin and alive unto righteousness sounds like madness to the world of the natural heart.

Despite this strangeness, this is preëminently the conception of salvation set forth in the Gospel. A very similar human concept has been the ideal of the philosopher, the promise of the social reformer, the dream of the mystic, the theme of the prophet, the Paradise of the Jew, the sweet Elysium of the Mythologist, the home of the Free Spirit among Pagans. Together they look for a "Golden Age" when human things will have been so changed as to banish all care and sorrow, when life will be filled with joy and bliss. They are severally strongly coloured with the personal peculiarities of temperament corresponding with the characteristics of the respective advocates. Their very exclusiveness stamps them with the label of their origin. Socrates would be in abject misery in the heaven of Proclus, where "Quietism, an unreasoning contemplation, an ecstasy which casts off as an encumbrance all the knowledge so painfully acquired, is the bourne of all life's journey." (Vaughan). And on the other hand Proclus utterly

fails to see any glory in the heaven of the intellectualism for which Socrates longed. The social philosophers, on the other hand, idealize a kingdom which is the happy goal of the race and which shall be the delightful inheritance of some far-off generation. The Jew, seeking a sign, waits for a transcendent manifestation from God by which the children of Abraham shall be reëstablished in the Holy City. Thus do human conceptions oscillate between absorptionist pantheism and religious or philosophic egotism. The mold into which they are cast bespeaks their limited destiny. Christian salvation, however, is not a human conception. In its every phase it bears the ear-marks of the divine. The doom in every human endeavor to realize the moral ideal is writ large in the total depravity of the human heart. The promise of success in the Christian plan is in its building upon the complete renewal of the depraved nature. Regeneration is fundamental. The distant goal is the perfected kingdom of heaven. Its transcendent harmonies are secure because it is a kingdom whence the discordant elements of sin are wholly banished. The re-born children of God, joint heirs with Christ, shall experience such surpassing glory as eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath entered into the heart of man. And this distinguished salvation is still further characterized by being more than a visionary ideal. Though we know not what we shall be we do know that we are now the sons of God.

Philosophy may precipitate a revolution, as it did in France, and transfer the scepter of power from one dynasty to another, or from one form of government to another, but the rulers and legislators are still depraved men. It is but the choice between two evils and the state is not saved. Formal religion may institute a mighty propaganda, bring under its spell vast multitudes and hold them for generations, as has been done by Catholicism and Judaism, but the law is weak through the flesh and the letter killeth. The Gospel saves because the Spirit giveth life.

"How hardly shall they that have riches enter the kingdom of heaven," rests upon a principle broader than mere material

wealth. It is hard for those whose whole mind has been taken up with the natural forces by which man attains his desires to rest himself for his highest attainment upon the free gift of God. The intellectual world has experienced the glory of its attainments. Knowledge has soared high and delved deep. The mysteries unfolded have again and again surprised the world. It is hard, for instance, for the abstract philosopher who has wrought his chain of logical sequences in accordance with which he believes the soul of man by natural forces became a moral person, and as he further believes that the soul's highest possibilities can only be the result of the natural processes, it is hard for him to lay all that down and accept the mystery of godliness by the regeneration of the soul through the divine spirit. The preaching of the cross is "to the Greeks foolishness." Herbert Spencer sadly illustrates this. He is perhaps the most intellectual man of modern times. His scientific learning is phenomenal; his philosophy profound, his logic keen. The whole learned world bows to the majesty of his intellectual greatness. But the heart of Christendom goes out to him with profound pity as he, with a tinge of sadness, confesses the state of his soul in view of his own conclusions. In his *Facts and Comments* he has this to say: "Of late years," speaking of the conclusions of his philosophy, "produce in me a feeling from which I shrink." Having riches of intellect how hardly can he open his heart to receive the regenerating spirit? The natural intellect repudiates the fundamental truth which Jesus preached, "ye must be born again." Salvation is pre-eminently the gift of God. It is godliness in the human heart by virtue of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. It is a mystery hidden from the wise and foolish, but revealed unto babes who in their docility abdicate their self-centered life for a life Christ-centered. It is nothing less than a changed personality. Salvation is the complete renewal at the source of moral impulse. The natural man inquires "how can these things be?" The regenerate man knows that "whereas once he was blind now he sees." They speak a different language. This new language must be learned at the mercy seat.

The acceptance of this salvation by spiritual regeneration is hard likewise for the Jew. His conception of religion bids him seek to appease divine wrath by sacrifices and alms. He will carefully cleanse the cup and the platter, but he utterly fails to appreciate that out of the heart are the issues of life. O, poor, weak perverted heart! How are we so fond of these earthly toys! Teach men that gifts and sacrifices is the way of salvation and there isn't anything within the range of possibility which will not be given up. They will make pilgrimages, they will build splendid cathedrals, they will intone their rituals amid dazzling splendour and with gorgeous pomp, their religion will shine with all the glory this poor world's accoutrements can give. The ease with which men fall into this method of holding objective manifestation for subjective religion, aye the ready tendency of ultra religiosity towards formal display suggests the old deceiver's strategy to thwart the Spirit by hushing conscience with the forms of godliness. The Samaritan woman spoke only what she had learned to believe was the essence of true religion when she said: "Ye say that in Jerusalem men ought to worship." She saw the Jewish race go up to the Holy City with superstitious reverence and come back bitterly to hate and persecute her own people so that she regarded their performances with contempt. Jesus replied: "Believe me, the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshiper shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for such doth the Father seek to be his worshipers." Christain salvation reverses the order of thought. The Jew would offer his sacrifices of worship in order that by them he might have favor with God. The Christian humbly acknowledges the divine favor given by grace through Christ and worships God in praise of his wonderful goodness.

Salvation thus conceived is a positive result amounting to a creative act. In the totality of human depravity Paul cries: "Oh wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" From the body of this death God by the Holy Ghost raises up a new man in whom the righteousness of God is matter of his own subjectivity. The evolutionary

Anthropologist and the experimental Psychologist challenge this doctrine because of the postulate of divine intervention. The scientific mind demands a point of contact from which to explain the continuity of the evolution whereby the man of sin becomes the child of God. But the facts of experience place the next step beyond death as further dissolution. Life is the point at farthest remove. This is the antithesis of Christian salvation. Modern psychology is seeking to bridge this chasm by the postulate of a subliminal self or a sub-consciousness as yet unexplored, within the realm of our personality, beyond the boundary of ordinary consciousness, whence originate the results manifest in spiritual renewal. This is a bold attempt to naturalize the supernatural. It amounts to a tacit acknowledgement of the fact of regenerative experience as issuing from beyond the boundary of finite knowledge where it is forced to admit an explanation which does not explain or surrender to the necessity of the operation of the supernatural within the realm of the natural.

Never before has the learned world been looking over and beyond the boundary of the finite as now. It is the day of glorious opportunity. It is for the Church of Jesus Christ to hold high and clear the lamp of the supernatural to which the men of science may fasten their chain of causes assured of a sufficient explanation. This can nowhere be demonstrated so effectually as right in the matter of experimental religion. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, thou hearest the sound thereof, canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth, so is everyone that is born of the Spirit." Spiritual new birth is the only adequate explanation of the real depths of religious experience whereunto the Gospel and Christian experiences of twenty centuries bear concurrent testimony.

The salvation offered in the Gospel of Christ therefore is spiritual. By it the sinner is enabled to appear before his God not having a righteousness of his own, "even that which is of the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is from God by faith." "We reckon therefore that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law."

God graciously for Christ's sake cancels our guilt, comes into us and makes us righteous with his righteousness, and gathers us to himself into glory. It is God's doing and it is marvelous in our eyes. He has given us the Spirit of adoption, "whereby we cry Abba, Father." The salvation Paul would preach in Rome was distinctively divine and "there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." To Him be the glory forever.

To this divine result—saved man—the Gospel is God's means. In order to maintain the relation between the saved and their former selves God has ordained means of renewal adapted to his purpose. Since the method of personal intercommunion known to man is through the spoken word, God has condescended to communicate His regenerating and sanctifying Spirit to the soul of man through His word. Here God crosses the bridge as it were, and supernatural power takes a natural path into the human soul. "For it was God's good pleasure through the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe."

We find salvation, therefore, to be wrought by a supernatural power culminating in a supernatural result, operating through natural means. The natural means being the intermediate link, is dignified by the divine ordainment which resolved to use it. On account of the divine appointment it becomes a necessity having only extraordinary exceptions.

Resting primarily upon faith in the Divine Sonship of Jesus Christ, a faith divinely wrought, salvation depends upon the Word of God preached and received, "for no man can come to Me except the Father which sent Me draw him." "Flesh and blood hath not revealed this unto thee but my Father which is in heaven." "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." The case of Simon illustrates this. The subject of conversation is, what is the impression about Jesus. A variety of impressions are reported from the circle of those who have heard Him and heard about Him. "Some say, John the Baptist is risen, some Elijah: and others Jeremiah or one of the prophets." It is to be noted here that all those who

had these mistaken impressions had heard the word, but failing to receive the Divine Spirit by consequence failed to come to a living faith in the Son of God. Jesus then puts the question pointedly to His disciples, whereupon Simon replies: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Jesus' comment indicates that Simon has received a Divine revelation through a human manifestation. The significant point is that it was through the human manifestation that Simon received this faith in the Divine Christos, i. e., the Spirit operated through the word. God has made salvation dependent upon the acceptance of Jesus as the Christ, believing the forgiveness of sins through His blood. The Spirit works this faith, but He does it through the word. God's command is, preach this Gospel to all nations. This makes it imperative. To refuse is to deny. The disciple has no alternative. So far as he is concerned, the success or failure of Christ's kingdom hangs upon his preaching. It is not his concern whether the world say, "he is a prophet risen from the dead or some other spectral delusion." Such is not the fact. God will impress the fact. But the disciple is responsible for presenting the Divine Christ.

Its very method expresses the other-worldness of the Gospel plan of salvation. There isn't anything comparable to it anywhere. The prospect it holds out is the highest conception of glory. The revolution involved is the most complete thinkable. But when the instruments appointed for this stupendous task are measured by human standards they appear folly. Rome was acquainted with Imperial Edicts and the military stood guaranty for their enforcement. They knew the power of the scepter. To it philosophy and religion rendered obeisance. But here comes a company of humble preachers who are turning the world upside down by preaching the Gospel of salvation in the name of one whom a Roman governor had crucified in one of the outlying provinces. The band is small, without prestige of wealth or social recognition. They only preach and pray and are abundant in deeds of self-sacrificing love. But lo, there is a mighty leaven working. On Pentecost the Spirit sealed the promise of the Master. Their un-



worldly method is blessed. The gray dawn of the Day of the Lord appears. The expanding band goes forth. The first fruits of the Gentiles are gathered in. Still they go, not with wisdom of words, "but preaching the plain Gospel in the demonstration and power of the Spirit." Within three centuries after the black tragedy of Calvary the Disciple of the Nazarene ascends the Imperial Throne, saved by the power of the preached Gospel of Christ.

We refer to these facts to indicate in brief outline what may be said to have been prophetic in Paul's conception. Such were the thought pictures before his mind as he looked into that future when Rome should have received the message his soul yearned to bring. As he fed his soul with meditations upon the glory of the returning Messiah, the joy of his people redeemed, it was enough that the means to this glorious end had the Divine trade mark. For the sake of men and what the Gospel would make them he would become "all things to all men that he might by all means save some." Paul's eye was continually upon the future. In it he found his joy. There was genuine inspiration in it. It is a glad thing to contemplate a soul redeemed, a city purged of wickedness, the ultimate redemption of the human race. It is truly glorious. Paul looked upon a future in which these were an accomplished fact; a fact accomplished by preaching the Gospel.

Paul staked his life upon a certain conviction of these three primary truths: the Gospel saves; it saves through preaching; and there is no other hope for this world. It is our privilege to have a more inspiring prophetic view than Paul ever had. Look down the long column of the saints of God, made such by this Divine power. Mark the advance of the Lord's frontier. Dismay can only come from doubt; doubt can only result from a reckoning with flesh and blood. The ends of the earth are ours. Let us go up and possess the land for we are able. Again, and solemnly, it is noised abroad that ours is an age of spiritual declension. From every quarter comes the cry, there is a lack of men to preach the Gospel. The old Deceiver has suggested a variety of explanations. There is only

one. That one is the want of these three primary truths of the Gospel in the faith of the age. An unregenerate Church will not support the Gospel, and an unregenerate ministry will not preach the Gospel for the Kingdom's sake. A man with the Apostolic spirit will preach this Gospel even though he must live on locusts and wild honey. He has his Saviour's authority and his Saviour's hope, and he is satisfied. If these extremes are necessary, there are more heathen in the world than our statistics show. Whatever the relative status of those responsible there is only a single hope for improvement. That single hope in this Divine power is the Gospel. It accomplishes its necessary result everywhere even to the end of the world. Jonathan Edwards was banished from his Northampton parish because of his severe insistence upon the absolute necessity of spiritual regeneration. It was as hard for him to go to the Indians as it was hard for Paul to turn to the Gentiles. But Edwards became the human instrument of the mightiest spiritual revival since the Reformation of the sixteenth century. And last Autumn, after a century and a half, the scene of his herculean labors and Christian sacrifices was marked by a statue in bronze. Thus does posterity atone for ancestral wrongs. The power which revived the Church from its spiritual lethargy under the mighty preaching of Edwards is vital still.

Note the depth of Paul's conviction if you would understand the secret of his tremendous energy. Grasp the situation. Paul is looking out upon a world so completely ruined by sin that Divine rescue is its only hope. That Divine hope was present by virtue of the inherent power of the preached Gospel. These objective truths Paul converts into subjective experiences. So far as Paul is concerned, this conviction determines his attitude towards all else. The secret of his mighty impulse is in his subjective apprehension of these great thoughts. He is not ashamed of the Gospel, even to preach it in proud Rome, because he knows that through preaching it is Divinely effectual for salvation. This is the secret of Apostolic authority and power, and it comes by the succession of regeneration and spiritual communion with the Father and not

by the observance of rites pretending to ecclesiastical continuity.

This conviction consists in that spiritual enlightenment by which men know that this Gospel is Divine. By it Peter and John were able to say to the official council of Jerusalem "whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you rather than unto God, judge ye: For we cannot but speak the things which we saw and heard." The ultimate natural means to its production is the Word of God, the avenue by which the Holy Spirit enters and takes His abode in the human soul. These two truths must be held fast. No man can know that Jesus is the Christ except by the Holy Ghost; and the Holy Ghost brings that revelation by the word of God. Denial of the first breeds rationalism, denial of the second is the mother of numberless heresies by which the word is set aside and immediate spiritual enlightenment presumed.

The necessity of this conviction cannot well be overstated. With the question of the "*Theologia irregeneratorum*" we have nothing to do. God's word and His sacraments, indeed, in no wise depend for their efficiency upon the ministrant. But the necessity of which we are speaking is not for the sake of those who hear, but of him who preaches. For his own sake that inner certainty is indispensable. Without it he is like the hireling shepherd continually consulting with flesh and blood, and only waiting opportunities for personal advancement. With it he is the voice in the wilderness of sin crying "prepare ye the way of the Lord; make His paths straight."

The importance of the Apostle's conviction is absolute. This importance intensifies with the passing centuries. It comprehends the whole sphere of his activity. When it is remembered that the preacher's whole activity in his calling is contrary to custom the fact of incessant resistance is accounted for, a resistance which he can only meet by inner absolute certainty. "What antiquity could have easily understood was a religion made up of offices, customs, and usages; what it could not understand was a religion whose only institution was a person realized by faith." (Fairbairn). This is largely true still. If he would believe that by preaching the world must be saved he

must believe it upon its own merit, contrary to popular custom. Other methods will serve to build churches and gather congregations. Other methods may make more splendid showing even in things that look like religion, but they do not save. It is an easy matter to build temples and get a following, but to save souls one must "deny himself and take up his cross," and insist upon regeneration by the Spirit. There is great danger that zeal to build churches and gather congregations may obscure the true goal of Christian effort. Jonathan Edwards might have had a large congregation and a magnificent church in Northampton, but on account of his tremendous insistence upon regeneration he admitted no one to his congregation who had not satisfactory evidence of regeneration. Luther might have risen to the highest office within the gift of the wealthy Roman Church, but the conviction that salvation is not a ceremonial act, but personal experience, drove him from these splendid worldly possibilities to become the herald of a new age. At the basis of these salutary efforts was the sure conviction of the sole expediency of the Gospel method of salvation. With this conviction the preacher faces his task calmly. He knows that "Heaven and earth shall pass away, rather than one jot or tittle of this word until all be fulfilled." Without this conviction his message is only one among numberless other equally commendable efforts for social amelioration. How easily does religion fall from its distinctive preëminence to the level of mere ethical culture. It is robbed of its dignity and left poor indeed.

Emphasis upon inner certainty is especially pertinent just now on account of the prevalent attitude in learned circles toward the Word of God. One can scarcely lay claim to even moderate scholarship without having read at least the general outlines of the advanced thinkers of the present. And yet to have done so is to have been subjected to inexpressible danger. Modern scholarship would rob us of the Son of God and leave us the Son of man. It would make what for centuries has been God's means of His Spirit's communication, viz., His word, a mere book of largely antiquated moral aphorisms.

With Paul's conception of the world's need of redemption ;

a redemption which involves complete renewal by Divine power; that Divine power operating through the preached word; and his conviction, based upon inner certainty, that this method, and this method alone, answers the world's crying need; with these as the equipment of faith we hold the solution of the world-problems of every age. "For seeing that in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom knew not God, it was God's good pleasure through the foolishness of the preaching to save them that believe. Seeing that Jews ask for signs, and Greeks seek] after wisdom; but we preach Christ crucified, unto Jews a stumbling block and unto Gentiles foolishness; but unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God. Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men. But God chose the foolish things of the world, that he might put to shame them that are wise; and God chose the weak things of the world, that He might put to shame the things that are strong; and the base things of the world, and the things that are despised, did God choose; yea, and the things that are not, that He might bring to naught the things that are; that no flesh should glory before God." (1 Cor. I, 21-25, 27-29).

## ARTICLE IX.

## CHRIST'S THOUGHT OF THE CROSS.

BY REV. R. B. PEERY, PH.D.

According to the Synoptic Gospels, Christ's first clear announcement of his sufferings and death was made to the Twelve at Cæsarea Philippi, immediately after Peter's great confession. St. John seems to indicate that Jesus spoke of these things much earlier in his ministry; but John nowhere claims to write in exact chronological order, and it may well be that for the purpose of his Gospel he has recorded some things as having happened earlier than they really did happen. And so, in spite of the seeming testimony of John, scholars are generally agreed that Christ's first unmistakable announcement of his death was at Cæsarea Philippi, in the third year of his ministry.

But while not clearly proclaiming this fact earlier, Christ spoke a few pregnant words which have suggested it, had they only been understood. His words to the disciples of John hint at it: "Can the sons of the bridechamber mourn as long as the bridegroom is with them? but the days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then will they fast." These suggestions were not understood, however; and when Christ did speak plainly he was not believed.

Did Christ himself see his sufferings and death from the beginning of his ministry? Some have denied this, saying that Christ passed through three distinct periods, in each of which he thought to accomplish his work by different methods. They tell us that in the first stage of his mission he emphasized his teaching, thinking a promulgation of the truth itself would be sufficient; afterward, seeing that men would not accept the truth, he called to him a body of disciples, and thought to effect his purpose by attaching them to his person, and only in a later stage did he realize that it would be necessary for him to lay down his life for men. But we do not have to accept this theory. To the sympathetic reader the Gospels contain

several utterances which show that, while Christ did not speak openly of his death until late in his career, he himself was conscious of it from the beginning. Especially does the Temptation teach this; for was not the very essence of the Temptation an effort on the part of the devil to induce Christ to attempt the accomplishment of his work by an easier way than the cross? He had just been baptized and anointed with the abiding Spirit, and was on the point of beginning his mission. He foresaw the hard, rough road he must journey over, with its persecutions, sufferings and ignominious death. Just then the devil came and tempted him, saying: 'Since you are the Son of God it is not necessary that you take such a method of establishing your Kingdom. You need not suffer and die. Use your divine power, and accomplish your work by a shorter and easier way.' But Christ resisted and overcame the devil; and, fully realizing what was in store for him, he set his face from the very beginning steadfastly towards Jerusalem and Calvary.

The question naturally suggests itself, If Christ knew of the sufferings and death that awaited him why did he so long delay telling his disciples of them? There was a sufficient reason for this. They were not yet able to receive this teaching, and would have stumbled at it. Together with the whole Jewish nation, they had entirely overlooked those features of Messianic prophecy which relate to his humiliation and sufferings, and thought only of the dignity and glory of their coming king. So far removed were their thoughts from the idea of a suffering Messiah that they would probably have doubted Jesus' claims and deserted him had he spoken of this feature of his work earlier. And therefore it was necessary that he first educate them, and gradually lead them to a position where they could receive this truth. When Peter, as the spokesman of the Twelve, confessed, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," Jesus thought the time for which he had been waiting had at last come, and he might now venture to make this startling declaration to them. And with a sense of relief and gladness he told them what he had so long wanted to speak of but could not.



After the events of Cæsarea Philippi Jesus repeated the announcement of his sufferings and death from time to time, as opportunity and circumstances seemed to demand. But among all these statements in the Synoptical Gospels those which refer to the *meaning* and *significance* of his death are few and meagre. Much as we would like to have full and frequent statements on this vital point, Jesus in his wisdom has seen fit to leave us very little. But instead of lamenting the fact that we have not more it behooves us to study the more carefully that which we have, and to construct from it as far as we may, *Christ's own Doctrine of his Cross*.

There are three sayings of Jesus which undoubtedly reveal his conception of the significance of his death; and they teach us three distinct lessons.

The first lesson is that Jesus' death was *the natural result of his living a life of righteousness in an unrighteous world*. It was the expected consequence of his course of life and action. His words to the disciples at Cæsarea Philippi clearly show this: "If any man will come after me let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it." We might truthfully paraphrase these words thus: 'I will die as a consequence of my devotion to duty; and whosoever will follow me shall have to bear a like cross, and die for a like reason.' In his words to Peter, "Thou savorest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men," he suggested that there is an irreconcilable conflict between God and men, between righteousness and evil; and that men must choose the one, and thereby incur the persecution of the other. St. Paul expressed the exact idea categorically when he said, "Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus must suffer persecution." Jesus' death, then, came in the way of natural causality, because of the uncompromising attitude he assumed, and the righteous life he led.

We can easily trace the manner in which Christ provoked the hostility of the leaders of his countrymen. Most potent of all his words to them was his unflinching exposure of the shallowness and hypocrisy of the Scribes and Pharisees. They sat

in Moses' seat, and were fully conscious of the dignity and honor attaching thereto, and zealous to receive it to the last tittle. But Christ openly declared them to be "whited sepulchres," "ravening wolves," "full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness." Thus he fearlessly laid bare their hearts, and exposed their true nature; and for this they could never forgive him.

He also incurred their illwill by fraternizing with the common people of the land. Christ proclaimed himself a teacher sent from God; and he went around in teacher's garb, and performed the teacher's office. But he made himself accessible to the lower classes; he even went to eat with publicans and sinners. So did not the other Jewish teachers. Rather, they considered the common people unworthy of their notice, and treated them with haughty contempt. A Pharisee would have starved rather than eat with publicans; and he considered Jesus' course an insult and degradation to the holy office he had assumed.

Again, Jesus' disregard of certain ceremonial usages and rabbinical laws brought down the wrath of the rulers upon his head. He was not careful about washing pots and vessels, as they were; he ate, and permitted his disciples to eat, with unwashed hands; he disregarded the traditions of the elders in regard to the observance of the Sabbath and other things. And by this course he provoked their hostility, and brought about his own death. For these reasons they "went about to slay him," and in the end accomplished their wicked purpose. Jesus knew that his course would provoke their opposition and cause them to kill him. He bore in mind how they had persecuted and slain the prophets for a similar reason. Their question, Why do thy disciples fast not? reminded him that the time would soon come when he should be taken away from them. As he clearly foresaw, "at the end of this way of non-conformity stood a cross."

Whatever other meanings the cross may have, this is its first, simplest, and naturalest meaning; and all our theories about it must start out with this basal principle, that Jesus

met his death in the natural discharge of his duty, as a consequence of a life devoted to the righteousness of the Kingdom. And in this aspect of his sufferings he is not alone, but is a captain of a mighty host. We think of Stephen, who so soon took up his cross and followed his Lord; of Peter and Paul, and all the glorious company of apostles and martyrs who were persecuted for righteousness' sake. We remember Huss and Wykliffe, and Savonarola, and Cranmer. And we see the same principle working to day before our own eyes, making the world hate all sincere and consistent followers of the meek and lowly Nazarene just as it hated him.

Jesus' second lesson about the meaning of his death was given to the disciples on that occasion when the mother of James and John came and asked that her two sons might sit on Jesus' right and left in his Kingdom. The other ten were filled with indignation against James and John; and Jesus called them unto him and said: "Ye know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority over them. Not so shall it be among you: but whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister; and whosoever would be first among you shall be your servant: even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to *give his life a ransom* for many." Jesus' life was to be, in some sense, a ransom for the souls of men.

This idea of a ransom comes in abruptly here, and there is nothing else corresponding to it in the Gospels. Therefore Dr. Baur and others have doubted its authenticity. But the very fact of its strangeness and isolation is a proof of its genuineness, for an interpolator would put in something more in harmony with the whole passage. The fact that we find the word in both Matthew and Mark, our oldest and most undoubted Gospels, makes it impossible for us to doubt that this is one of the authentic sayings of Jesus.

There has been a good deal of speculation as to the source from which Jesus derived this idea of a ransom. Ritschl thinks it was derived from Psalm 49:7: "None of them can

by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him," together with Job 33 : 23-24 : "If there be a messenger with him, an interpreter, one among a thousand, to show unto man his uprightness : then he is gracious unto him, and saith, Deliver him from going down to the pit ; I have found a ransom." Ritschl draws from the first of these texts the inferences that the ransom is given to God, not to the devil, and that Jesus represents himself as able to render a service in the place of the many, which no one of them could render. From the second he deduces the inference that Jesus distinguishes himself from the mass of men who are liable to death, as being exempted from that doom ; and regards his death as a voluntary act by which he surrenders his life to God. Therefore he concludes that Jesus meant to teach by this passage that "the Son of Man gave his life to God a ransom for the lives of men doomed to die, which he was able to do, because his life was that of an exceptional being, one among a thousand, not a brother mortal, but an angel who assumed flesh, and became the Son of Man that he might freely die."

Dr. Balmain Bruce thinks this savors too much of the professional theologian to be in keeping with the simple and natural manner of Jesus ; and he himself connects the words with the incident of the temple tax, which occurred only a short time previous. On that occasion the collectors of the temple tax came to Peter and asked him for the half shekel paid annually by every adult Jew, in accordance with Moses' law. The half-shekel is there represented as a ransom for the soul, insuring the life of those who paid it against plague (Ex. 30:12). Bruce says : "When the customary tribute was called for Jesus consented to pay it, under protest that as the King's son he ought to be free ; his purpose being not seriously to object to payment, but to direct the attention of his disciples to the conciliatory spirit by which his conduct was guided, in tacit rebuke of the ambitious passions which had led them to dispute by the way which of them should be the greatest in the kingdom. There are obvious points of resemblance between the two situations. In both there was an outburst of ambition within the

disciple-circle to be dealt with; in both the Master, conscious of being a great one—King's Son or a King—holds himself up to his disciples as an example, as one who does not stand upon his rights and dignities, but assumes a servile position in a spirit of humility. There is not now, as then, a half-shekel to be paid in the form of a temple tax; but there is a life to be demanded within the next few days, a tax also imposed in the name of religion, to be as cheerfully paid, and with greater ease; for the owner of this life was so poor that an exaction not exceeding in value half-a-crown was beyond his means. How natural that the mind of Jesus should revert to the incident which occurred in Capernaum three months ago, and, connecting the tribute then paid with its original purpose as stated in the book of Exodus, should conceive of the new act of self-humbling service about to be performed as the paying of a ransom for the people, who in ignorance were on the point of throwing his life away as a thing of no value! It is as if he had said: 'Then they asked of me a small coin for their temple, which I had not to give; now they ask of me my life, which it is in my power freely to lay down. This life, though they know it not, is, like the half-shekel, their ransom money, and I gladly yield it up to save their souls from death.'\*

Whatever may have been the genesis of the saying, it undoubtedly teaches us that Jesus' life was given as a ransom, his voluntary death in some way becoming the means of delivering from death the souls of the many. He died that we might live. Just how his death brought life to us we are not taught here; nor are we assured that life could not have been brought in some other way. Jesus did not mean to give a solution of the problem, but simply to state the bare fact that his life would be given as a ransom.

We saw above that Jesus was not alone in suffering because of the righteous life he lived, but that he has a host of companions. Here, however, he differentiates himself from the race, as not being subject to the same law of death that others

\* *"The Kingdom of God,"* p. 239.

are subject to, and therefore being in a position to give his life a ransom for the lives of others. Hence his death was an offering for sin, and he necessarily suffered alone. He can have no companions in making atonement.

The most advanced teaching of Jesus concerning the significance of his death was given when he instituted the Holy Supper. We read in Luke: "And he took bread, and when he had given thanks he brake it, and gave to them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. And the cup in like manner after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you." Matthew's statement about the cup is clearer still: "This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many unto the remission of sins." Here we have the idea of a sacrifice clearly taught—Christ's body was broken for others, his blood was shed for the remission of men's sins. His death stood in the position of a sacrifice, effecting remission of sins and salvation.

That Jesus should on this occasion represent his life as being a sacrifice was quite natural, for the sacrificial idea was in every mind. It was the season of the Paschal feast; the sacrificial lambs had that day been slain, prepared and eaten; and the thoughts of all were turned to the sacrifices. When Jesus uttered these words he had in mind the Paschal lamb slain at the feast, commemorating the deliverance of the children of Israel from Egyptian bondage. He also probably remembered the solemn rights connected with the ratification of the covenant at Sinai; and the prophetic oracle of Jeremiah concerning the new covenant of grace. Bruce says: "We may regard Jesus as offering himself to the faith of his followers at once as a Paschal lamb whose blood shields from the destroying angel; as a peace-offering whose blood sprinkled on the members of the holy commonwealth consecrates them to the Lord; and as a sin-offering on the ground of which God bestows on men the forgiveness of their sins. The last of these three views is the one chiefly to be emphasized, as the gist or kernel of the final

lesson taught by Jesus concerning the significance of his death."\*

Our Lord thus taught that his death was in the way of a sacrifice through which men receive forgiveness of sins and are rendered acceptable to God. By virtue of this sacrifice God is reconciled to the world, and can regard with favor a rebellious and sinful race. We are accepted in the Beloved, because the Messianic King and his subjects, by virtue of the precious blood, have become an organic unity in the Father's sight.

This I understand to be the substance of Christ's teaching concerning the meaning of his death, as recorded in the three synoptical Gospels. It was merely given in the germ, and not often repeated. Inasmuch as so little emphasis is placed upon Christ's death by himself, while it is so often and strongly emphasized by Paul, some critics tell us that the Church's doctrine of the atonement is from Paul, and not from Christ; and that the whole theological system centering in it is Pauline and not Christian. That Jesus' statements concerning the meaning of his death are few and meagre in comparison with those found in the writings of Paul and the other apostles is freely admitted; but may there not have been sufficient reasons why this should be so? Could Jesus so well have emphasized the influence of an event yet unaccomplished, and entirely misunderstood even by his most intimate disciples? Does it not rather seem wise and natural that specific teaching on this subject should have been postponed until the portentous event was accomplished, and Jesus' followers had come to accept it as a foretold and necessary part of their Master's career? Because the time for full and clear statement had not yet come Jesus spoke little about this great matter, and left the fuller and clearer teaching to be given later by others, under the guidance of his Spirit. You remember he told his disciples he would come again as the Spirit, and would recall to them all the things he had formerly taught them, and guide them into all the truth. And so Paul and Peter, led by that promised Spirit, building on Jesus' own foundation, gave the full and complete signifi-

\* *The Kingdom of God*, p. 248.



cance of his death. And so we reverently accept their more dogmatic statements as but the development of the germs Jesus himself gave, the open flower of which his words were only the swelling buds.

Paul, in stating his doctrine, uses the very word that Jesus used: "There is one God, one mediator also between God and men, the man, Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all." And Peter's words are almost an echo of Christ's at the Last Supper: "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we being dead to sins should live unto righteousness, by whose stripes we are healed."

---

## ARTICLE X.

### WOMAN IN THE PULPIT.

BY MARY DEVER.

An article appeared in THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, October, 1903, in which an attempt was made to prove that women should not be allowed to preach. The writer, Margaret R. Seebach, declares that women are illogical, and unable by the very constitution of their minds, to cope with the situation. She very aptly, yet no doubt unintentionally, illustrates her belief by her own argument. She says that the power of sustained logical argument is necessary to hold men in the Church, and that men alone are capable of putting forth such argument. I quote: "Can woman's preaching hold men in the Church?" We are tempted to reply: "Has man's preaching held men in the Church?" I quote again: "The great need of the Church in all ages has been such a virile and logical interpretation of truth as will appeal to men. The Church *has* the women." The writer here assumes that men can hold men in the Church, and then says that after nineteen hundred years of effort they have failed to do so; that women are in the Church and that men, broadly speaking, are not.

She further assumes that the opportunity to speak in public as a minister of necessity must do, would tend to develop in a

woman's mind a demoralizing condition of vanity and love of admiration. This leads me to think that the writer misapprehends the mission of a spiritual leader. Christ, the ideal religious teacher, says of himself that he "came not to be ministered unto, but to minister." Does not the preacher who is noble, self-sacrificing, and consecrated to his work, strive to follow Jesus' example in ministering to the world's need? And is there anything in such a life to make either a man or a woman vain? Further than this, a woman who would be vain in the ministry would be vain in any other walk of life. Vanity in the pulpit would receive swifter retribution than elsewhere, for there is no other position in public life so assailable as that of the preacher. But admitting for the sake of argument that any woman who comes before an audience is exposed to this danger, what shall we say of our women singers? Shall they be permitted to sing in the Church? Shall they be permitted to sing anywhere? The temptation to vanity would be far greater in their case. Stages are set, lights are arranged, artists design costumes—all to enhance the beauty of the singer and heighten the effect of the song. Shall we say that all this leads to vanity and frivolity, hence women should not be allowed to sing? A thousand times no! And if we did say so, who would be the losers, we or they?

There is one great safeguard against vanity, however, that is always operative, and it is this: A truly great man or woman is incapable of feeling it, no matter how gifted he or she may be—yes, even though possessing the gift of tongues.

The writer's next objection is that the subjects of women's sermons are disappointing in that they would seem to suggest lectures on philosophy, art or literature. Let her ride with me past the churches in any of our cities on Sunday morning, and read the large placards deemed necessary to attract audiences to churches presided over by men. Some of these cards bear subjects that are almost startling, and escape being laughable only by indicating a truly pitiful and oft-times tragic lack within. We commiserate those who respond to the invitation to the feast, for many of us know from sad experience how scant is

the fare. In a certain church a sermon was delivered upon the following subject: "What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander." This was a man's subject. Could a woman have made a more unfortunate selection? Would you not rather take chances on the supposed lecture on "philosophy, art or literature" than listen to such a discourse? I admit that this is an extreme case, but many others have come under my own notice that are scarcely less open to criticism.

The writer says further that the education and long training "necessary in order to gain the best results" would take up so much of a woman's life as almost to compel her to remain single, since, if she married, this time would of necessity have been wasted. No earnest effort for culture is ever wasted, but we will not dwell on this point, for a far greater error occurs in the passage. It has been the mistake of the Church in all ages to assume that education can make a successful minister. It can not. Who educated Paul? In what institution did he gain that voice at whose call men forsook their daily occupations to follow? Where got he that eye beam that revealed an inner life of the soul unknown to the generality of those about him? Whence came that glorious courage that made him strong and serene in the very extremity of suffering? For he said that he had been "flogged times without number," "at death's door," "lashed," "stoned," "shipwrecked" and often hungry, thirsty and cold. The grace that enabled him to bear these things sweetly, and with increasing rather than diminishing strength, did not come as the result of theological training. Were it so, we would have many Pauls among us. Paul knew the "deep things of God" and he told those things to others. He had a message and the people heard him.

"One accent of the Holy Ghost  
The heedless world hath never lost."

Without a spiritual message no man can ever become a spiritual leader, no matter how highly educated he may be. His education would only serve to enlarge his field of labor, and give him greater adaptability to meet the needs of those who receive his ministration.

The errors that I have thus far pointed out in Mrs. Seebach's argument, are, however, on the surface. The deep, the fundamental mistake is her assumption that we may choose to hear or not to hear those whom God has graciously prepared to speak to us of him, and of his love. Whether men or women, it is of his grace that they tell us, and it is of this that we long to hear. Whoever comes as the bearer of "good news from a far country," let him speak! It is not a question of our allowing him to do it as a favor to *him*. The obligation is all on the other side. It is we who are graciously permitted to hear.

The question of sex should never come up in any line of service. Whom do we serve? Is not life itself "divine service?" If one is able to perform certain work admirably and well, let him do it in God's name, and let us cheer and hearten him with high praise. There is no woman's cause apart from man's cause. It is our common cause. Therefore, let us not blind and hamper those who are helping to solve the great questions of life. In so doing we would be running counter to him who bestows "every good and perfect gift." "REVOLUTIONS OF AGES DO NOT OFT RECOVER THE LOSS OF A REJECTED TRUTH FOR THE LACK OF WHICH WHOLE NATIONS FARE THE WORSE."—Milton.

---

## ARTICLE XI.

# CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

## I.

### ENGLISH AND AMERICAN.

BY REV. M. COOVER, A.M.

What was king Saul's malady that found expression in melancholy, and then again in sudden fits of evil temper? Most mental diseases are traceable to physical causes. Are there any traces discernible in the character or doings of Saul? It was truly an evil spirit that would animate a man to do the things that Saul did; that would induce him in fits of physical passion and excitement to alienate from himself consecutively

his greatest prophet, Samuel; David, the best friend in his kingly court with the whole clan of his suspicioned supplanter; and Ahimelech with all the priests of the realm.

Why should Saul show special spite against all the religious factors in his domain? Did Ahimelech's assistance to David inspire it all? Did the religious guides of Saul admonish him for some special sin? Had Saul a secret sin, fashionable and reputable in the court, yet frowned upon by his religious advisors? Some particular reason, some refusal to reform, may have made Samuel mourn for Saul.

Some cherished sin as a physical cause may have banished from him the Spirit of the Lord and given occasion for the possession of himself by an evil spirit.

The pleasurable narcotic of Orientals is opium; the delightful intoxicant is hachish. Was Saul a hachish eater?

Mr. Charles Creighton, M.D., thinks he was. Hachish is a sweet exudation from the flower of the hemp plant, a shrub or bush growing in thickets eight to ten feet high. The leaf and the young fibre, as well as blossom and seed, possess intoxicating properties.

Dr. Creighton reasons as follows: In the *Song of Songs* (5:1), Saul's love melody, we read:

I am come into my garden, my sister, my bride;  
I have gathered my myrrh with my spice;  
I have eaten my *honeycomb with my honey*;  
I have drunk my wine with my milk.

The king makes a frank confession unknowingly in his rapturous invitation to his love. But the phrase of the confession so revealingly significant is not *wine with my milk*; but *honeycomb with my honey*. Literally the Hebrew poet says, my *wood* with my honey. The Septuagint translators did not know what to make of this word *wood*, and translated it *bread*, my *bread* with my honey. Jerome guessed at it when he made the Latin Vulgate, and his guess has been followed as inspired *ipse dixit*. He translated *wood*, *favus*, honeycomb. But Saul's poetic expression meant most probably hemp wood, or thicket, the exudation of which was the delectable intoxicant.

A strange command was given by the king before the battle

of Michmash: "But Saul adjured the people, saying, Cursed be the man that eateth any food until it be evening, and I be avenged on mine enemies." There was evident danger of something that might cause a forfeiture of possible victory over the enemy. "And all the people came into the forest (thicket or wood); and there was honey upon the ground. And when the people were come into the forest (thicket), behold, a stream of honey dropped; but no man put his hand to his mouth; for the people feared the oath." That day they had taken a temporary temperance pledge. "But Jonathan heard not when his father charged the people with the oath; wherefore he put forth the end of the rod that was in his hand and dipped it in the honeycomb (thicket), and put his hand to his mouth, and his eyes were enlightened" (brightened). Jonathan was saved from death by the execution of the oath only by the vigorous clamor of the army. The king felt the force of constitutional limitations of kingly government, though he was making strenuous and wise effort to maintain efficient moral discipline in his army. Intemperance was the danger of incipient success.

Jonathan's eyes were brightened by his moderate indulgence of refreshment to stimulate his energy in the pursuit of the enemy. The incipient effect of hachish is the dilating of the pupil of the eye. Then follows temporary stimulation of the nerves and brain, soon yielding to dulness and mental stupor from over-indulgence of the stimulant. The resinous exudation from the hemp flower was quickened in its flow by the midday heat of the sun, and Jonathan refreshed himself by dipping hachish to his mouth as he pursued the enemy.

Dr. J. Moreau, a French practitioner, wrote a medical work in 1845 on the effect of music upon the insanity of the hachish eater, without thought, however, of Saul and Jonathan, and learned that it had a soothing influence upon the morose spirit.

The experiment of the harpist in asylums for the insane has proved a failure; but the insane fits of the hachish eater are readily subdued by music.

The seemingly barbarous treatment of king Agag at the hands of the prophet Samuel when that prophet fell upon him

and hewed him to pieces has its explanation in the conjecture that the Amalekites were hachish venders. The Amalekites did not live a settled life as agriculturists or town dwellers; but like the Midianites were roaming Bedouin traders and slave dealers, living on plunder, robbery and barter of various wares. Palestine suffered as do Manila and Monrovia at the hands of intoxicant venders. It might not fare well with the modern brewer or barkeeper to meet with the prophet Samuel. A vice that may have ruined a well-born, divinely chosen king, and despoiled a kingdom of its noblest men, may well have its emisaries very summarily dealt with. The vice of Saul and his followers was possibly that of hachish eating with its entailing disasters. This may seem but an acute conjecture; but many accepted advances in historical research and truth have at first been deemed vagaries. Dr. Creighton does not assume his case proved, but deems his examination with biblical coincidences suggestive of approximate and probable facts.

—*The Expository Times* for January.

---

The current thought at Eastertide in theological paper and magazine is the wonder and glory of the resurrection. The theological mind that revolts against materialistic interpretations of religious verities here all unwittingly becomes sadly materialistic. Not merely in the nature of the resurrected body, but also in the mode of resurrection is there confusion between spirit and matter. Similitudes of the resurrection of man and of resurrected nature in springtime, of chrysalis and of ovum development, miss the significance of Jesus' resurrection. What materialists we become unconsciously when we superficially scan the uniqueness of true resurrection. Nature speaks and tells what it knows and what it has experienced of immortality. The plant asleep in the cold earth during the gloom of winter; the scaly tree and rugged branch seemingly dead, now put forth new green life; the grain cast into the earth sends forth tender stems to feel after the summer sun. All tell the story that things seemingly dead are alive after all.

Yet this is but analogy, and not real similitude. The tree



was not dead, else no leaf would appear. The flower stem and seed of grain were not dead, only dormant. In each case it is but resuscitation of life which only slumbered. It was sown a natural body, and is raised a natural body, and proves nothing more. Nature tells what it knows, but can tell nothing positive of spirit and of its life. But Jesus was dead, not physically dormant. No physical germ still palpitated in his pierced heart, or quiet brain. Jesus was absolutely dead. Nature tells its sweet story of resuscitation, but it cannot tell the history of Jesus. His resurrection exceeds all powers of nature, is superior to all that nature can do.

The seed of plant and tree is sown a natural body and is raised a natural body; but man is sown a natural body and is raised a spiritual body; and of this spiritual body nature has nothing to say. Jesus must come and live and die and rise again that man may know more than nature can teach. When the sere leaf falls to the ground and the bough is bare, we know that the tree is not dead, but has gone to sleep for the winter; for we have seen it come to life again after its sleep of natural dormancy. It was not dead. But man dies; and the cry of the ages has been, If man die, shall he live again?

The greatest calamity in the universe is death. It is the direst enemy nature knows, and against it there is no antidote. When the tree dies, it is disintegrated and returns to material elements, losing all identity with the form of life it once had; it is no more a tree.

Jesus came to save from mortal calamity, a calamity mourning for which became a lucrative profession. Hired mourners followed every bier, and every traveller met was constrained by human sympathy to turn and join the funeral procession. Nature did not tell the Hebrew that the soul was immortal. Flowers did not whisper the story of immortality. But life and immortality came to light through the gospel. Jesus' resurrection told the true story to an anxious world; and now nature with its manifold resuscitative beauties suggests to us what we already know and believe; illustrates a truth discovered not through nature, but by personal revelation through Jesus. It was the great problem in Paul's mind how the resur-

rection-body as he was taught it, could be the embodiment of the sinless and permanent.

The Talmud taught a gross form of resurrection; men would rise with perpetuated human appetites and propensities; they would eat, and drink, and be restored in marriage relation. Whose would be the wife of seven deceased husbands was deemed a puzzling question to be put to Jesus. The conception was so gross that Saducees revolted from the teaching, and declared that there was no resurrection either of man or angel. That was what revelation and interpretation did for Israel before Jesus came; and nature taught them nothing more by all it could reveal. All that nature can tell, God lets man study in nature to discern for himself. But nature could never tell, nor did ever tell, this story of real resurrection.

Now when the gospel has revealed this truth, nature comes in with its poetry, with its beautiful analogies, and clothes the body of revealed truth with verdant garments, beautifies with graceful suggestion the great mysterious fact. The grave is a door to a world which we have never seen. No seed or dormant plant has ever passed this portal. It is a path which no fowl knows; which the vulture's eye has not seen; nor has the lion's whelp trodden it. Nor does man return across that portal to tell what he experienced beyond. Death is absolute, absolute for the natural body. The green shrub comes back each year to tell its story; but man comes not back. Man is sown a natural body, and is raised a spiritual body; and the difference between the natural and the spiritual is as great as that between a block of wood and a poetical thought.

For Paul the body signified the occasion of sin, and a restored natural body would be the return of mortal appetites which would restore the regime of sinful man. The unique revelation to Paul on the way to Damascus flashed to his soul the knowledge of a spiritually alive Messiah. After all, notwithstanding the false opinion of the Jew, the Messiah could die, and still be Messiah. It was now clear to the great apostle that the future body is one of spirit, and is part of our personality now; for there is a natural body, and there is a spiritual

body; but that which shall be for permanence of personality is spiritual.

So conspicuous is our physical life; so all-embracing the necessities of our bodily nature, that the body is ever asserting itself in our thoughts of the immortal. The tangible and visible engross us to the eclipsing of keener conceptions of our intrinsic immortality. We are so slow getting at the heart of the secret. Only when we grow old and experience the weakness and fatigue of living in flesh do we long for a frictionless existence where there is no pain. Then in the poignancy of wearied flesh we come to grasp the significance of the experience in Joseph's garden, and the glory of the resurrected body of Jesus. It matters not much whether this body of flesh be ever raised; for flesh and blood shall not inherit the kingdom of heaven. The body that now is is not the body that shall be. The resurrection of Jesus did not demonstrate simply that man shall rise again, but significantly as well, the spirituality of that body. Matter may be but a form of energy; but with energy in its complex movements is resistance and friction; and with friction comes heat, passion, weariness and worn-out organisms. There is no stability in forms of matter. There is a conserved total unit of energy, but constant flux of form. The natural body is a transition, a sensorium for the soul till the spirit of man can immaterially feel for itself, and think apart from material incentive and stimulus.

In that realm where is no night, where no rest nor recuperation for body is needed, where love acts and man serves without weariness, in an embodiment, frictionless, absolutely adapted to spiritual activities, there shall be realized in full the import of the resurrection glory revealed in Jesus.

Some believe that all nature is alive; this is *panbiotism*. Others believe all nature has intelligence; this is *panpsychism*. But in either case the disintegration of the body is the dissolution of the personality. In this view of man the soul is not an entity. Man is nothing psychically but feeling, a specialized form of sentient substance, the highest efflorescence of matter. And yet he is only the flower of nature, not its fruit. He is but a coördinate factor in the eternal gyration of world substance

which never bears fruit. The atom is everything that man is. The spontaneity of the atom makes man. Man is indeed part of an impersonal God, and God may be called Father, as the energy of transcendence, in the same sense as we speak of Mother Nature. As coal is transformed solar heat, so is man transformed radiant divinity; but the divinity is simply cosmic energy. This is the monotheism of monism. It is purely atheistic pancosmism. There is nothing unique; all things are common; all things are participant of the One.

The uniqueness of Jesus Christ tells a different story. He who was both atom, and conscious divine personality, teaches another doctrine concerning the personality of man.

Man is body and soul. Must man to be man be always soul joined to matter? Matter never thinks alone apart from personality. Will personality survive contact with matter? Will death end all?

Revelation through Jesus Christ answers these questions. The incontrovertible fact of Jesus' resurrection, and the superiority and transcendence of his resurrected body to the properties and possibilities of matter, constitute the Gibraltar of our faith and assurance.

## II.

GERMAN.

PROFESSOR S. G. HEFELBOWER, A.M.

The present state of the theological and practical life of the Evangelical Church in Germany is very complex. So many forces are at work, so many and such varied tendencies are making themselves felt, that it requires but a few years to effect a complete change. The nineteenth century opened with the Rationalism of the previous age still on the throne; it closed with a chaos of schools and tendencies, which, in almost all instances, defy classification without elaborate limitations. Yet, in this motley complex two general classes are easily distinguishable, with all shades of theological thought between their clearly marked extremes. Since we lack the historical perspective for, say, the last half century, it is plain that the study and the statement of present day theological and ecclesiastical positions and tendencies is very difficult; and yet if this generation is to act intelligently on solving the problems of the living present, it must understand them.

Dr. Theodore Kaftan, General Superintendent of Schleswig, has made a very happy analysis of the general theological and ecclesiastical conditions and problems in Germany in the preface to his *Vier Kapitel von der Landeskirche*, Schleswig, 1903, which has called forth some notice from theological journals. We condense from the review of Luthardt's church paper, and give it at some length because of its importance.

Kaftan acknowledges that Christianity has lost its former absolute sway in the world of culture; but he denies unconditionally that the present struggle is for its existence, it concerns rather its authority in the life of man, according to the two sides of his nature, the theoretical and the practical; and these are manifest in theology and in the Church.

"There always was a struggle, but formerly it was chiefly against the antireligious; now it is the religious that have taken up arms, not against religion, but against theology as such and against the Church as such. But theology must be careful lest it be resolved into the science of religion, and the Church

must guard against degenerating into a religious association." In both instances it is a struggle concerning the Gospel, for this is their common foundation.

The present contest is for theology as theology; for it did not cease to be theology when its representatives began to yield to the influence of natural science and doubted the supernatural birth of Christ and his resurrection. It emphasized a special existence and working of God in Christ, wholly unlike anything elsewhere in the history of the world. Even an erring theology is still theology as long as it holds to a special revelation of God in Christ. But the *historical method*, which accepts only that which agrees with present phenomena and conditions, does away with a special revelation of God in Christ, and thus resolves theology into the science of religion and Christianity to one among the many religions of the world. Accordingly, the cardinal point in the struggle of theology for its existence as such is the revelation of salvation in Christ.

The struggle concerning the Church goes parallel with this. Kaftan defines the Church as "the congregation assembled around the word and sacraments and administering the word and sacraments," which are the bearers of that which is given in the special revelation in Christ. Both are as much historical realities as the revelation of salvation in Christ itself is an historical reality, and are therefore authoritative. But nothing is more objectionable to the "modern man" than an authoritative doctrine of the Church which requires obedience. He is likely to reason thus concerning it: The kernel of the Reformation was freedom; this is slavery, it is therefore Catholic and not Evangelical. Hence the present struggle of the Church centers around the question: Is there a real word of God, and are there real sacraments? That is, the struggle concerning theology as theology and concerning Church as Church is, when resolved to its last elements, the struggle concerning the Gospel, and with it the Church and her theology stands or falls. But the Gospel stands firm, and will stand as long as the world endures, and this guarantees existence to the Church as Church and to theology as theology.

But this by no means solves the problem. The question arises: What must theology do in order to keep the victory? Here we must emphasize the fact that not just *one* theology is possible on the basis of the Gospel. Theology must change her dress according to the times in which she lives. "The errors of our day will certainly be overcome, but not in the Saul's armor of the old theology, but in the armor of that theology which springs from the union of the unbroken Christian faith with the intellectual life of our times." We need a "modern theology of the old faith."

As the garment of theology "is woven from the threads of time," so also is the garment of the Church. The anti-religious spirit is really waning. Dead rationalism, which blights all spiritual life, sways a broken scepter. The spirit of the times is religious and is becoming more so. But, unfortunately, it has little sense for things appertaining to the Church. Yet there must always be a Church where the means of grace are administered. However, the Church must adapt herself to the cultural and social conditions of the times. At least this is certain, the church of the future cannot be a church of clericalism, for that is Romish; nor can it be a state church. There remains only the church of the congregation, i. e., one in which the congregations administer their own affairs. This can be a "free church," which presents many difficulties to the German who has seen nothing but the sporadic attempts along this line in Germany, or it can be a "church of the people," whatever that means. Kaftan prefers it, but it is not clearly described.

Of all periods in the development of the theology of the Christian Church, the last century, or at least the last half of the last century, is probably least known, which is accounted for by the lack of historical perspective. However, some very useful books have appeared, and we mention them for the sake of those who may wish to investigate that age which, next to the living present, is far the most important; for, though Protestant theology is the work of the Reformation, we have it to-day in a form that shows the marks of every age that it has



passed through since then; and, after the sixteenth century, the last century has been most influential in molding the theological thought of to-day.

Probably the safest and most useful of all books on the subject is Frank's *Geschichte und Kritik der neueren Theologie*. Third ed., with chapter by Seeberg of Berlin on Frank's theology. A. Deichert, Leipzig, publisher.

Kuebel's book: *Ueber den Unterschied zwischen der positiven und der liberalen Richtung in der modernen Theologie*, is also useful, but it is generally considered out of date. Munich, 1893, pub. by Beck.

Seeberg's work, mentioned on p. 142 of this volume, is the last publication of importance on this subject, and it is perhaps the most readable book on this age that can be gotten. However, its value consists not so much in his style as in his thorough mastery of the tendencies and schools of the century that he treats and in his new viewpoints. Pub. 1903, by Deichert in Leipzig.

More and more the position is being emphasized in German theological circles, that Schleiermacher's influence molded the theological thought of the entire nineteenth century, and that von Hoffman, Ritschl, Frank et al., were greatly influenced by him, either directly or indirectly. The books just mentioned give great prominence to him as the one who, more than any other, broke the sway of eighteenth century rationalism and introduced a new theological age. But during the last ten years there has been growing what might be called a Schleiermacher literature. Elements in his system are the most common theme for theses for students trying for the Lic. Theol. degree, and a number of books and pamphlets have appeared, the most important of which are as follows: *Die Entwicklung des Religionsbegriffs bei Schleiermacher*, by E. Huber, pub. 1901, by Dietrich in Leipzig; *Die Lehre Schleiermacher's von der Erlösung*, by Stephan, pub. 1901, by Mohr in Tuebingen; *Schleiermacher's Theologie und ihre Bedeutung fuer die Gegenwart*, by Thiele, pub. 1903, by Mohr in Tuebingen; *Die erkenntnistheoretischen und metaphysischen Grundlagen der dogmatischen Systeme von Biedermann und Lipsius* (more valuable for the general light that it throws on theological movements of the century than for its discussion of Schleiermacher), by Fleisch, pub. 1903, by Schwetschke in Berlin. Kattenbush has greatly increased the value of his *Schleiermacher zu Ritschl* by adding to his 3rd edition, 1903, a chapter on the religious-historical method.

## ARTICLE XII.

## REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

*A Primer of Hebrew.* By Charles Prospero Faguani, Union Theological Seminary. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Pp. X and 119. Price 1 50 net.

This little work emanates from the class-room. It is the outgrowth of the explanatory and simplifying methods which every teacher of Hebrew is obliged to employ even when he has the very best grammar in his hand. It is designed for beginners and for those who have no teacher, and it makes good its claim. The difficulties that are peculiar to the Hebrew language are here reduced to a minimum. There are some new terms employed, such as the "extra long" and "extra short syllable" for "simple Sh'va" and "plena syllable," but they will not confuse the student for he is not under the necessity of unlearning the old familiar names. We welcome and commend the work as we would any book that offers to smooth the path to a knowledge of the "sacred tongue."

T. C. BILLHEIMER.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, COLUMBUS, O.

*Dorothy*—A Story for Our Girls. By G. W. Lose.

Dorothy, a story recently written by Rev. G. W. Lose, is a most charming and interesting little book. The scene is laid in Tennessee and in New York state, during the dark years of the Civil War. The plot is fascinating, and the author is especially happy in his delineation of character. The highest moral atmosphere pervades the story, and though not, what one would call a great novel, it is a delightful little romance, and is well adapted for our Sunday School libraries and for children.

HENRY W. A. HANSON.

EATON AND MAINS, NEW YORK.

*The Child's Religious Life.* A Study of the Child's Religious Nature and the Best Methods for Its Training and Development. By Rev. William George Koons, A.M., B.D., with an Introduction by Thomas B. Neely, D.D., LL.D. Pp. 270, 8vo. Price, \$1.00.

It is a hopeful sign of the times that the training of the young from a moral and religious standpoint is receiving renewed attention. Alarm has been justly felt at the disproportionate effort given to physical and mental development. It is being recognized that the formation of right character in the child ought not to be left to chance, but that it ought

to be studied in the light of psychology and pedagogy, as well as of Scripture.

The book before us is suggestive rather than exhaustive. It is an outline rather than a discussion. It is useful in exposing various misconceptions, and in opening the literature on the subject. One of the deficiencies of the book is the entire absence of any allusion to catechisms in the teaching and training of children.

The theme is presented under four general headings. Part I. is explanatory of the purpose and point of view. Part II. is a study of the child's religious nature. Part III. treats of factors in the formation of religious character, and Part IV. of methods.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & COMPANY.

*The Christ Story.* By Eva March Tappan, author of "Old Ballads in Prose," "Our Country's Story," etc. Profusely illustrated, crown 8 vo. \$1.50, net, postage extra.

As a rule your reviewer is inclined to disapprove of all attempts to improve upon the story of the Saviour's life as set forth in the Bible itself. In opening this book we approached it with our usual feeling of distrust and prejudice. But we find ourselves pleasantly surprised.

Miss Tappan, who has high rank among writers for children, has told the story of the Saviour from the Annunciation to the Ascension in simple, dignified language. She has kept also a clear stream of narrative, following the order of events in the life of Christ, and adding what is almost indispensable for children—certain incidental description of the country, bits of explanation about manners, customs, usages, costumes, ways of speech, and so on. These interpolations are so skillfully introduced, so neatly woven into the texture of the story, as to make a vivid narrative, reverent in tone.

As an aid to parents and teachers in the religious education of young persons and children, we should think it an excellent supplement to the scriptural narrative.

Especial care has been given to the matter of illustration. There are about forty-five full-page reproductions of masterpieces of the great classic and modern artists, and twenty-five half-title pages having smaller pictures from the same sources set in appropriate borders designed by Emil Pollak.

M. E. RICHARD.

*Von der Farm auf die Kanzel.* Eine Erzählung von W. Witte. Druck der Lutherischen Verlagshandlung, Columbus, Ohio.

The scene of this pleasing little narrative of struggle and devotion is laid among the broad and fertile farmlands of the west. A German household is its center. The father, who prospers above his neighbors, because he supplements his tireless industry with the principles

of economy of the Fatherland, wishes his second son to follow the practice of law, or of medicine; the mother, on the contrary, has consecrated him to the ministry. The youth's older brother sides with the father, and his sister with the mother. By the devotion and self-sacrifice of these latter, the young man is finally enabled to pass successfully through college and seminary, and to reach the goal set for him, in missionary work.

The story emphasizes the dearth of students for the ministry, and suggests a remedy in the consecration of sons to the work by devout mothers.

W. H. BRUCE CARNEY.

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY, NEW YORK.

*As Others Saw Him.* A Retrospect, A. D. 54. By Joseph Jacobs.

This book is a fictitious narrative, purporting to have been written in A. D. 54, recounting certain scenes in the life of Christ, his trial and finally his crucifixion. In it Christ is treated only as a Prophet who reproved and disappointed his people, and was finally put to death. The aim of the volume of two hundred and thirty pages is best set forth by the writer himself in "After words," at the close of the book.

"The preceding pages, therefore, may be regarded as a sort of Apologia of the Jewish people for their so-called rejection of Jesus. As a matter of fact he mainly expressed movements which were already in existence among the Jewish people, as I have endeavored to show in my description of him, and was chiefly opposed in principle to the sacerdotal party, who therefore, as a natural consequence, brought about his death after a hurried, and from a Jewish standpoint, illegal trial.

"By displaying the essential Jewishness of most of Jesus' doctrines I was hoping to attract the interest of Jews themselves toward the most influential figure that has appeared among them."

In a word the writer seems to aim at a better understanding between the Jew and the Christian in the new light of twentieth century investigation. From the Christian's point of view he woefully fails to accomplish this end. He reads all the divinity and supernaturalism out of the life and office of Christ; he makes his doctrine and teaching that of the Jew of the time; he at best places him in the same category with Socrates; yet he seems to endow him with a spirit and power that he utterly fails to explain.

Evidently the writer expects to harmonize the opinions of the Jew and the broadest school of the higher critics concerning the person and life of Christ. But the book will scarcely appeal to the learned, while the popular mind will not be moved by that which it contains.

M. E. RICHARD.

*The Religious Sense in its Scientific Aspect.* By Greville Macdonald,

M.D. New York: Armstrong and Son, 3 and 5 West Eighteenth Street. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1903.

We have, in this attractively published volume, three lectures given before students of the several departments at Kings College, London, June, 1902. Its title well defines its religious aim. The author faces his audience in the name of science and seeks to add its testimony to the deep, ineradicable religious nature of man. His method is the application of the evolution hypothesis as the explanation of the world-formation and the nature of everything in it from its germinal beginnings to its crowning product in man. He asserts the brotherhood of all life—adopting the law of Heraclitus that nothing lives but in virtue of its becoming otherwise in growth and change. Everything comes “through inheritance.” Back of all the evolving forms of life he postulates the Idea, the Law, “the great unknown Law, in virtue of which they are evolved and exist.” “Like all other human attributes, the religious sense is an inheritance from mighty small beginnings, else man is a special creation: a theory we cannot study biology and hold.” “Primordial protoplasm holds all the essentials of life, growth, procreation, death.” “The elements of consciousness must have been present in the primordial protoplasm, else man could not have been evolved from it.” The question is asked: “If the sponge-sarcode possesses all the elemental properties of man, must we accord to him a soul?” It is answered: “We do not belittle the oak-tree because of its beginning in the acorn; nor is man’s soul the less because its possibility lay dimly in a particle of primordial protoplasm.” “The religious sense is no new acquirement. I trust I shall convince you that we have actual evidence of the presence of religious sense, in many manifestations, throughout the world of life. For my purpose is to show you that as structure and function augment in the evolving forms of life, so do they give us increasing evidence of the relation of each individual to the eternal law of which it is a manifestation.” And he proceeds to offer evidence of the religious sense—which is identical with the ethical—in amoebae, the simplest particles of protoplasmic life as they, myriads of them together, build sponges. “Each kind of sponge is a colony of innumerable individuals working together toward a common object, in which they are unconsciously concerned.” The special significance of this action is explained, that “each of these sponge-sarcodes is intent upon its function. Indeed, all life depends upon the fact of its being intent, of its intending something, whether conscious of the fact or not.” In the little sponge-sarcode’s life and function, we find ourselves face to face with the lowest indications of religious sense—the *sense of obligation to obey*.” “The religious sense in its scientific aspect” is thus interpreted as a divine lodgment of the principle and actuality of religion, as the “idea” or “law” of action in all life from its start. “It is my purpose,” says Dr. Macdonald, “to show that the religious sense prevails through all creation. I want to insist upon

the point that this sense of religion has evolved by slow processes of gradation as all other attributes, whether structural or functional, have evolved."

In a prefatory synopsis, the author divides the presentation of the subject in three lectures: The first deals with the story of the simplest social life; social life, that of the sponge, and shows how each individual in the community serves self, the community and the unknown Law in which it has its being; thus it deals with the Religion of service. The second deals with the manifestation of the Law in the renunciation of self-interest and shows how the beautiful comprises obedience to Law, and thus reveals the truth of the religious sense. The third lecture discusses the Religion of Freedom, and shows how, through man's emancipation from the chains of the Law, he attains greater power to fulfill the Law, although through this sense of freedom comes the possibility of degradation."

Such an argument, no doubt, is kindly meant, and to some may offer support to belief in the reality of man's religious nature—founding it upon the eternal Law of all life-existence and tracing it everywhere. It may, however, be well questioned whether persons generally or men of acutest and discriminating intellect will feel that there is much, if any, gain in turning away from the traditional method of reasoning to man's religious nature directly from the human moral consciousness and need of God, to this argument appealing to the evidence of a religious nature in the entire animal world where its signs and evidences are so remote, obscure and hypothetical. And this doubt is increased when the argumentation is examined in critical judgment. For though it is delivered in the name of science, it is not science that is given us, but idealistic speculation. Scientists know that this evolutionism which puts abstract "idea" or "law" to work as the explanation of all real, concrete being is not proved, but assumed as a working hypothesis. That to which we are treated is not science, but an attempted idealization of phenomena under the evolutionist hypothesis. It is a work of the imagination—of poetic fancy. Dr. Macdonald's accounts of the life of the sponge, the daisy, the guelder rose, are delightful poems, interesting and beautiful, but not science. A measure of good service may, however, be accomplished by the argument in the case of persons whom acceptance of evolutionism has robbed of belief in a personal God and His more direct creation of man in His image. It may enable them still to see that God is, nevertheless, pressing His will upon their souls through their reason and conscience.

The author has not defined his conception of God and of His relation to the world. Some passages seem to suggest idealistic monism. Yet in the closing part of the last lecture he appears to concede the conception of God as an eternal and omnipresent Personality. To readers who desire to know what kind of thinking scientists of the evolutionist persuasion are doing, this volume will be interesting and entertaining.

M. VALENTINE.

EATON AND MAINS, NEW YORK AND CINCINNATI.

*Advent and Ascension. How Jesus Came and How He Left Us.* By E. W. Faunce, D.D. Cloth 12mo. Pp. 215. Price 75 cents.

The supernatural character of Jesus best explains his supernatural works. The quality of his deeds is most adequately accounted for by the quality of his being. The great miracles of Jesus, inaugurating and closing his earthly career, are the ones mentioned in the ancient Church Creeds. His virgin birth, and his resurrection and subsequent ascension, are miraculous acts wrought upon Jesus. His supernatural being forms the envelope enclosing and originating his own supernatural deeds.

Dr. Faunce has chosen a great theme, and given a thoughtful outline. His development of the theme, however, is more of a popular nature than critical. But this theme demands accuracy of detail. The making of books should be curtailed to the critical, at least to the accurate, in this our busy as well as acutely inquiring age.

Dr. Faunce aims to marshal the evidences conclusive of indubitable act. But evidences to be convincing must not be surmises. Zacharias and Mary are represented as imparting personally to Luke the story of the infancy of John and Jesus. But Luke did not take up his pen to write till he was a man, and he was a collector of records relating to the Holy Family most probably when he was a companion of Paul while Paul was a prisoner in Caesarea c. 58-60 A. D.

It is not likely that Mary lived to be an octogenarian, nor that Zacharias reached the age of 150 years. This uncritical popular style forces the reader to a depreciation of the character of the whole evidence as given by the author. This is a region of conjecture, and the conjectures of Prof. Ramsay and Dr. Sanday are more reasonable, that while the story of Christ's infancy as recorded by Matt. is from a man's statement of events, the record by Luke is the femininely delicate report from a woman and handed down through a woman.

Luke's comprehensive knowledge of the Herods, and of matters pertaining to the court, suggests that through Joanna, the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, the story of Mary has been transmitted.

The Song of the Angels at the nativity; the Magnificat of Mary; the Benedictus of Zacharias; and the Nunc Dimittis of Simeon, indicate the copying of records; for Luke did not compose these inspired treasures of literature, and their authors had long left the scene of these events.

In respect of the resurrection, and the quality of the resurrection body of Christ, Dr. Faunce seems to be much influenced by the authors of *The Unseen Universe*. The theory of a remaining unseen germ resident in the properties of the physical body after death, offering the capability of a finer material but unseen body, is neither adequate physics, nor comprehensive metaphysics. The spiritual body is scarcely to be conceived as composed of etheralized matter. The analogy of mind is better than that of material properties.

M. COOVER.